

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1342829

THE WAY
TO
PERSONALITY



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Box

Indices

43

49

53

55 nre n letter 63 n best 144

146

THE WAY TO PERSONALITY

BR
121
R58
1916

Sermons

THE WAY TO PERSONALITY

marked through

A Study in Christian Values

BY

GEORGE B. ROBSON

LONDON

HEADLEY BROTHERS

140, BISHOPSGATE, E.C.

1916

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

To my Wife

PREFACE

(IN TIME OF WAR)

THERE are men who tell us that this unparalleled war has written on the wall the doom of Christianity. Those whose Christ is not after the flesh know that it is not so, but there are some, to whom Christ is still Lord, who wonder if Jesus was not in some things pertaining to His teaching a child of His time, and whether He would give the same counsels if He were amongst us in the body to-day. And there are others by whom Jesus and His counsels have been definitely dismissed, if not condemned, as being no longer equal to the occasion.

We shall certainly have to make up our minds about these things if we desire to be sure that never again shall such a calamity be sprung upon an unprepared Christian Church.

Has the teaching of Jesus any real and final value for the complex relationships of life in the present day? This book attempts to answer that question.

GEORGE B. ROBSON.

Christmas, 1915.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PART I.—THE WILL TO PERSONALITY	
I. THE LADDER TO THE STARS - - - -	13
II. THE AGE-LONG QUEST - - - -	23
III. THE HERO OF HEROES - - - -	30
IV. SONS OF GOD - - - -	41
V. THE SON OF MAN - - - -	48
VI. THE CHRISTIAN END - - - -	55
PART II.—THE CHRISTIAN TYPE	
I.—THE BEATITUDES - - - -	63
II. THE FIRST STEP TO LIFE - - - -	69
III. DIVINE DISCONTENT - - - -	76
IV. THE WAY THAT SUCCEEDS - - - -	82
V. THE PASSION FOR RIGHTNESS - - - -	89
VI. CONSIDERATENESS - - - -	96
VII. THE SENSE OF DIRECTION - - - -	103
VIII. THE PEACEMAKERS - - - -	108
IX. PAYING THE PRICE - - - -	114
X. THE RESULT - - - -	118

CHAPTER	PAGE
PART III.—THE WAY TO PERSONALITY	
I. ANOTHER LOOK AT JESUS HIMSELF — — —	129
II. A NEW BEGINNING — — —	136
III. PERSONALITY BY ADVENTURE — — —	144
IV. PERSONALITY BY FAITH — — —	162
V. PERSONALITY BY WORSHIP AND PRAYER — —	169
VI. PERSONALITY BY FELLOWSHIP— — —	176
 APPENDIX A.—BY WAY OF APPLICATION.	
I. THE NEED FOR CHRISTIAN THINKING — — —	187
II. THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY — — —	189
III. CHRISTIANITY AND WAR — — —	196
IV. CHRISTIANITY AND INDUSTRY — — —	201
 APPENDIX B.	
ON NIETZSCHE — — — — —	208

PART I.

THE WILL TO PERSONALITY

*"That Man must still to some new worship press
Hath in his eye ever but served to show
The depth of the consuming restlessness
Which makes man's deepest woe."*

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

*"When we become the enfolders of those orbs, and the pleasure
and knowledge of everything in them, shall we be filled and satisfied
then ?*

"No, we but level that lift to pass and continue beyond."

WALT WHITMAN.

CHAPTER I

THE LADDER TO THE STARS

THERE is no satisfactory definition of Man. Wise men have described him as the clothes-wearing animal, the tool-using animal, the laughing animal. But I heard one day in the street a description that went deeper than those of the wise men. A mother was addressing her small son from the door step.

"You are a discontented little animal," she declared, "That's what's the matter with you."

She was nearer the truth than she realised. That is what is the matter with mankind generally. The clothes and the tools of man are but the expression of his discontent, and even his laughter, often so near to tears, springs from his sense of the gulf between what is and what might be.

William Blake has pictured him finely in the few inches of a woodcut—a morsel of unrest at the foot of a ladder whose top is among the stars. His cry goes out into space, "I want! I want!"

That ancestor of yours, sitting at the door of his cave a hundred thousand years ago, contemplating the possibility of making the first handled tool by tying a sharp stone to a stick,—it was true of him. The one thing we can say with any certainty about him is that he wanted something more than he had. Whatever he got suggested something better, and perhaps the next would be the finally satisfying thing. But it never was. And as, by the time he had carefully finished his tool he had begun to outgrow

it, so, when at last he wrought his dreams into thoughts, and his thoughts into speech, there was always something from the dream left over in his heart. It is so still.

In time he found a means of saying what words cannot utter, and the plaint of the reed and the throb of the drum tell the tale of his longing. Is it not the secret of music that it whispers to us of the way we have come, and grips our hearts with that same unrest which first set man on his adventure? It is the homesickness of the soul which cries out on the violins. The oboe tells the story of all our wanderings and sorrows. The trumpets are surely the echo of that challenge to things which rings within us. And the noblest of all music, in which strife and unrest are ended and only pure joy remains, is it not a hint of the song we shall sing when at last we shall have won home?

At some time the unceasing pressure of man's unrest, his sense of the never filled gap between dream and deed became articulate, and he made an account of it. The story of Eden and the fall, and similar attempts, come out of the deepest consciousness of our race. Wise men do not laugh at them. They are as true as Blake's picture and mean much the same thing.

When man enters history, and from then until now, the story is woven about the names and deeds of those in whom the spirit of unrest found the readiest listeners. They stand out in every page, these pioneers, and in every field of achievement, and not only for deeds reckoned good. Even the "bad" has won admiration when it was big enough and savoured sufficiently of life. Men have honoured the doer, the thinker, the finder, the maker, because in him they saw fulfilled a little of what they craved after. His victory was their victory; he had enlarged

the bounds of life for them. If they could not lead, at least they could follow. The one thing they could not comfortably do was sit still.

What is this spirit of unrest, this driving force which urges us on without ceasing? What is it we want?

Thinkers of one sort and another have answered our questions.

Plato, you remember, put down our unrest to the fact that we are of heavenly birth, and that, despite the heavy layer of earthliness which clings to us, a memory of our origin now and then struggles through. Poets have followed him.

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home.

The answer of the poet-philosopher and the philosopher-poet, put into clumsier words, would seem to be that the unrest of man is just a spiritual home-sickness. Like Eden to Adam, the gates we came out of are guarded by flaming swords. But if we go right away round we are sure that we shall find an open gate and a welcome at the other side and enter again into that free life where man gives names at his will to all creation. And may be we shall find the ancient taboo removed, and eat not only of the tree of knowledge, but also of the tree of life.

When poetry and philosophy join forces, they can present a strong case.

Another answer from philosophy without poetry. The driving force behind our demand for something more is the *Desire for Happiness*. This is not a dispute about words, but if we take them at their ordinary valuation that answer does not cover the ground. Happiness is an accompaniment, a by-product, a follower that like other followers has sometimes

to take his own chance of coming in at the end. Not that he is not always welcome, but he could not always be kept in mind while the main business was being done.

A philosopher who had no faith in happiness at all has told us that what urges us on—or at least keeps us going—is the *Will to Live*. He makes it sound quite reasonable until we think of splendid and terrible things done by men with an exaltation of spirit which makes the *Will to Live* look poor and shrunken. Then we look for something that sounds more hopeful.

Is it the *Will to Power*?

“Wherever I found a living thing, there found I *Will to Power*. . . .

“He certainly did not hit the truth who shot at it the formula: ‘*Will to existence*,’ that will doth not exist!

“For what is not, cannot will; that, however, which is in existence—how could it still strive for existence?

“Only where there is life, is there also will: not, however, *Will to Life*, but—so I teach thee—*Will to Power*!”*

There is one weakness in this answer. It is not sufficient as it stands. Power is of no use until it is applied, and when Nietzsche tells that the driving force behind our discontent is *Will to Power*, we are bound to ask, if we wish to be clear, Power,—to what? It is the more important because his phrase is meant not only for an explanation but for an ideal, so that to get wrong at the beginning is to be wrong all the way. We will all agree with Nietzsche’s answer if we can fill in the “to what?” in our own way.

We are told that the idea flashed upon the mind of Nietzsche ■ he watched ■ regiment of artillery

* Thus spake Zarathustra, II., 34.

thunder past him, gay with the brilliant uniform of 1870. Perhaps the source of his inspiration, coupled with the fact that he himself was of sickly body, and but for that would have been actor rather than spectator, explains why "Will to Power" came to carry for him the meaning, power to appropriate, to injure, to exploit others,—in short, the Will to Bully. He was wrong in finding that in every living thing, for we have good reasons for believing that within the bounds of the same species and even beyond them there is no such universal exploitation, but a large measure of co-operation. In any case, however, the rule of the jungle need not be a rule for us.

It is one of Nietzsche's fundamental errors, due, it would seem, to a sentimentalism which so often leads him to mistake violence and swagger and impudence for power, and to demand that virtue shall carry itself with the air of a truculent drill sergeant.

Not power to exploit, but power to——?

Perhaps we can come to a better understanding if we try our second question. What is it we want? I will speak for myself as an ordinary man.

I enjoy life well enough to want to continue in it, and I prefer to be happy. But I do not want these things naked, so to speak. There are some things without which existence would be intolerable, and I am quite prepared to risk happiness in trying for them. There are things I want to do, things I see could be done. I want to do them—in my way if possible, or help in the doing of them if they are beyond my single strength. At any rate, to see them done. I want my sense of fitness and beauty and fair-dealing satisfied in the world of things and activities and men. I want to have the discords resolved and the story make a good ending. There are things I want

to be. I want to be master in my own house; to be free. I want to know. I want to get round the next corner. In a word, *I want to express myself completely in life.*

I may be foolish in my wants, but I do not think I am singular.

The driving force behind this desire, behind all human life, now comes more clearly into view. It is a stirring moment to stand and watch the guns sweep by, and Nietzsche was led astray by it. Had he been less susceptible to mere noise and display he would have gone a step further and hit upon a more real world than the one he discovered.

The driving force behind human life is Will to Personality.

It was true of the first man. The dawning of Personality was the beginning of his unrest. What disappointed him all the time was that he never got himself quite expressed in anything he did or experienced. Not that he knew what he wanted or even thought about it. You are a long way on the road to getting what you want when you know just what it is. Even the idea of Personality is comparatively new. But every new experience of man added something to him, though it did not always make him happy. Everything he acquired promised him a longer reach, though it sometimes became an additional burden to carry. When he ate the heart of his enemy he had a dim idea that he absorbed something vital and himself became something bigger thereby.

"The history of mankind," says Mr. H. G. Wells, "is the history of the attainment of external power." It is more than that, it is the story of his long journey towards Personality. All his tragedies come out of the fact that he has so often missed the way.

Our individual bodies, we are told, go through a sort of *résumé* of the physical history of our race. Is it not also true of ourselves as persons?

"It is not to diffuse you that you were born of your mother and father, it is to identify you. . . .
Something long preparing and formless is arrived and formed in you,

You are henceforth secure, whatever comes or goes. . . .
And I have dreamed that the purpose and essence of the known life, the transient,
Is to form and decide identity for the unknown life, the permanent."†

God, the old stories tell us, made man in His own image. He compounded him of the dust of the earth and gave him life, not as to the rest of the animals, by a word, but by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life—His own breath. I think they were quite deliberate also when they pictured man as being made alone, carefully, in a special day's work, for he is the greatest of God's experiments. Man became a living soul and started on his journey to the stars.

When I have told Eastern villagers this story they have said in reply, "Then the real part of man has the same nature as God." We may leave it at that.

■ ■ * ■

"And now," you say, "please define Personality."

I am reminded of the story of Socrates. "How shall we bury you?" said Crito. "As you please," was the answer, "only you must catch me first."

That is the difficulty about defining Personality; we have not caught it yet. There was a time when it was freely defined in such ways as this:—"Personality is that self-hood which shuts itself up against everything else, excluding it thereby from itself."

† Walt Whitman: *To Think of Time*.

The philosopher opened box after box of the puzzle until he came to the last. That is the magic box, which will not open until you know the trick, and when it is open turns out not to be a box at all, but a door into fairyland. The philosopher thought it was solid; it was his mistake. What he defined was the self-consciousness out of which Personality has to grow.

Wise men are rather shy of defining Personality now. They tell us that complete Personality belongs only to God, that it is not a hard and dead thing, but a living thing, and for us an ideal; that it is possible that only a small part of our personality has managed so far to find expression. They use the figure of an iceberg, of which the greater part is submerged. They have spoken of the subconscious mind, a reservoir of unknown powers.

If that suggestion has been to some extent discredited because the subconscious seems also to be the fount of our most foolish and wayward dreams, it is only to make way for the better suggestion that our personality cannot be sharply marked off at either end, that there is a super-conscious area also, from which spring those ideas which we cannot positively define or imagine but which, none the less, form the background of our thinking. Man is discontented. Why should he be? How explain his idea of a perfect world, of a complete personal life, of things infinite? Only by assuming that they are the steadfast background against which he can perceive the changes and limitations amongst which he finds himself. He sees, but he cannot analyse or define what as yet is beyond his reach.

We shall only know what complete Personality is when we have reached it. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." For the present we can only describe Personality—not define it—as, *that within*

which takes hold of life and environment and uses them for self-organisation and self-expression.

It is the most important thing about us, this something which Socrates felt could not be caught, which we cannot exactly define; so important that instinctively we turn to it as the measure and test of value for everything else.

There have been teachers to tell us that we are wrong in so doing, religions which tell us that our idea is an illusion, organisations whose object is to override us, but they have not yet succeeded in killing that instinct, nor is it likely that they will. They would have been better employed in helping us to understand it and in guiding us into right ways of fulfilling it. The greatest personality our race has seen, and still the most discussed, appealed to his hearers and said, "Why do not even ye yourselves judge what is right?" When he wanted to find a phrase for the most hopeful thing that ever happened to one of his characters, he said, "He came to himself." It was not the end of his journey, but it was the beginning.

The Indian goldsmith carries in his equipment a small black stone upon which he rubs what is offered to him for gold. He seems by its use to be able to tell fairly accurately what proportion of gold is in any alloy you may give him.

We will use what we know of Personality for our touchstone.

That which best answers my Will to Personality, which is found finally to give the greatest field to it or, in other words, what most enlarges life for me, is good.

That which thwarts my Will to Personality, which denies it expression, which limits life, is evil.

That method of living which tends most to the enlargement of life and the deliverance of Personality

from hindrances and entanglements and illusions will be the wise way of living.

And since, so far as we can discover, the production and development of Personality, is the final reason for the existence of this world, or, in other words, that my Will to Personality is derived from some infinite Personality, since we must attribute Personality to that which makes us persons, then such way of living will be what religious people call the Will of God, and ultimately, therefore, the only successful way of living.

That religion or view of the world which gives Personality the greatest value, which brings it into the largest place without losing it by the way, will be the truth for me.

CHAPTER II

THE AGE-LONG QUEST

IF we are right in thinking that our achievement of Personality is the end of the Creative Will, of which we are, so far, the highest expression, will not the way of achievement be obvious? Will it not be the line of least resistance? There are good reasons against such a conclusion. Experience suggests to us,—No resistance, no achievement. Every stage of life, from the lowest upwards, involves the overcoming of resistance. The only things we can use or even know in the external world are those which offer some resistance.

Take the aviator as a parable. His ambition is to fly; his object is to overcome the downward pull of the earth and the resistance of the air. He makes his machine as light as possible and as little wind-resisting. He finds that even so small a matter as the shape of a wire affects his speed. Yet, without the pull of the earth he dare not go up, for he might not be able to get down again, and without the resistance of the air he could not get up or fly when he was there. The line of least resistance would be to leave flying to the birds.

Is the way, then, the line of most resistance? I do not quite know what that would be in aviation, and, indeed, it sounds rather a foolish question, but the line of most resistance has practically been suggested as the way to the highest good. To exploit, to use other persons as tools, to be master by brute force, to win, not by co-operation but by compulsion,

that has been tried and advocated, and to some people still seems the true way. It does not work; it never has worked, and when carried out to the end means self-destruction.

The achievement of Personality is a greater adventure than the conquest of the air.

Apart from such reasons, however, the history of man suggests that the way is narrow and the gate strait. What have seemed obvious ways have not been a great success. The defects in the present order of the world scarcely need detailing. Every now and then some one arises to declare passionately that all our knowledge, all our discoveries, have but left man in the same old bondage to things. There seems to be some queer kink in the nature of man by which he manages to pervert the greatest gift to evil and destructive uses. We sometimes talk as if progress was automatic and certain, but it is not so certain as the fact that things left to themselves do not get better, and that every gain has not only to be won but also maintained at great cost and by unceasing vigilance. And when we have done bragging of our Progress, the uncomfortable thought creeps in:—What is the good of it all if it does not result in the production of finer and yet finer personalities? Do the ways we have individually or corporately tried do this?

Yet we can picture Utopias. It has been a favourite recreation of man. But when we said, "Yes, beautiful, Now show us how!" the trouble began. Blake's picture of the ladder to the stars seems to have one defect. Should he not have left the ladder out? Is there anything so obvious as a ladder about the way to Personality? It seems more like the search after the Holy Grail. It was somewhere, waiting to be found, but only rare souls ever caught sight of it, and they blazed no way for others to follow.

In connection with the description of Personality the phrase "self-expression" was used. But which self are we to express? As someone plaintively said, "There are such a lot of me!" We remember Whitman's "I contain multitudes." I find in myself animal desires and instincts, desires of the mind, capabilities, limitations, timidities, hopes, aspirations, aversions, odd peculiarities of temperament, a certain general condition of bodily health,—a miscellaneous assortment indeed, often not on the best of terms with one another. That they all condition the possibilities of Personality there can be no doubt, and what is more, any of them seem capable, on small encouragement, of claiming to be the self which is to be expressed.

Personality is the kingdom I am to win. It is clear that if any one of these things is in control and denies the rest, or if there is no control, but only anarchy and disorder, if there is continuous civil war or crises of revolution with a new president after each, I must expect the weakness that follows such things. Is there in me that which has the right to be master, which all will acknowledge and serve if it makes its proper claim?

Is there any way at all, or is this a purely individual adventure in which no man can help another or even pass on a useful hint or two to save him from the worst mistakes? Somehow we cannot quite accept that as it stands. We continue to be invincibly hopeful. We build our Utopias, our castles in the air, each generation trying to improve on the picture. The fact that we can, or think we can, improve on the picture is encouraging. And each man of every generation tries to realise for himself some little corner of security in which he may have leisure and freedom to express himself. How pathetic that after all these years of corporate life, of learning how

to live, it should still be to countless thousands of men the *summum bonum*,—a little security, a little space to turn round in, where one may feel the dignity of personal being before going to the grave!

Is there any universal way to Personality? In detail, perhaps not. That would seem to be the failure of all codes of laws. The more detailed they are, the more certainly they are out of date before the ink on them is dry. The more exacting they are, the more free men resent them as an insult to their dignity. Freedom is part of our demand and, like Personality, is a thing to be won. The code of laws chokes us. Our personality wilts and shrivels or else violently rebels in that air.

Yet surely if there is a right and true end, there will be a right and true way. It may turn out to be quite simple, missed by men for that very reason. Maybe part of our difficulty is that we do not form right or clear conceptions of what the thing we seek is. It is of the nature of the case that we cannot say of perfect Personality that it will contain just these qualities and attributes and no more, but is there any sort of standard, anything to measure by at all? Can we liken the perfect Personality to anything else?

We took, for a working description of Personality, that it is that within us which seeks self-organisation and self-expression in life and environment. I do not say that we can describe God in that way, but we must attribute something like that to the Creative Will, however far short of the truth it may come? If there is truth in that, it suggests, as has been remarked before, that we shall have to look Godwards for our idea of Personality. This seems like going round in a circle, or explaining the little known by the unknown, but I am not sure that it is. My own inclination is to think that we really know God better

than we know anything else. Our difficulty is that we do not recognise our knowledge as knowledge of God, because we have so often made up our minds beforehand what God ought to be, and so get lost in arguments and reasons, instead of following the impulse of our nature. We are afraid to let ourselves go. That is the trouble with most of us. Meanwhile let it be said that "man apart from God" is a theological invention.

There is, however, another way, which it may be wiser to take for a beginning, though we may find it lead into the one we are leaving. If the achievement of Personality is the end of the natural order, it would seem right to argue that perfect Personality must be something in the Creative Will which seeks expression in our personalities, and that there might in the course of history be attempts at achievement which would help us, revelations of Personality which would serve as guides for us. Is not that the direction in which we must look? Remember the wise words of Plato: "The really brave man will either learn or discover the truth; or if that be impossible he will take the best of human words and the most irrefragable, and, carried on that as on a raft, will sail through life in continual jeopardy, unless he shall find some secure position, some divine word, if it might be."

And if the divine word could be a shining example, how much better! It is an example we want. We begin all things by the imitation of what appeals to us. There is no other way, for we come into a world which is already a great inheritance and stand upon the shoulders of countless generations. We do not dream of beginning at the beginning and working out everything for ourselves. We awake to science, to art, to music, to poetry, to discovery, by contact with others, above all by contact with those who

have been great enough to make a universal appeal. Our very language has been made for us. We have to learn it by imitation. We take thankfully all that has been won for us and use it; we improve on it if we can; we apply it in new directions if the occasion arises. That is how we keep moving on and succeed in pushing back a little farther the limitations and mysteries that surround us.

Now in this matter of Personality there are countless teachers, codes of laws, lists of virtues, philosophies, religions, traditions, rules of life. The choice is bewildering. When we come to make our selection, how are we to judge? There are some questions we can ask. What is the end they propose to us? Will it satisfy our demand for Personality? There are some, for instance, that begin by telling us that our Will to Personality is the thing we must renounce as an illusion. The end they propose is the extinguishing of Personality. Can we accept that?

Others tell us the virtues we must practise or the vices from which we must abstain. They do not always tell us why. We like to know why. And if they can persuade us that this is the way to Personality, there is still another question to the teacher, "How did it work in your case?"

Alas! alas! Human, all-too-human, these teachers, or may be not human enough.

We are sometimes told that we must not look at the lives of those who would teach us, that all we need to ask is whether their words are true or false. But that will never do in this matter. The moral character of a gardener may make no difference to the correctness of his advice on planting potatoes, but to go for advice on Personality to a man whose own Personality bears too obviously the marks of discord would be like going for advice on potato planting to a man whose own potatoes never came

up. If all I want is a list of moral virtues I can get that easily enough. I can make one myself for that matter. But I am not alone, I think, in being a little weary of moralists. Let me have a sight of some satisfying personality. I shall be glad to hear him. Show me the teacher who is greater than his teaching, who himself is the greater part of his teaching. Tell me where to look for the Pioneer who has won through and found that finally satisfying life which I seek. He, if he can be found, will be my safest guide. He will also be most fully expressive of the Creative Will. If God can reveal Himself and His purpose at all, it will be through a personality.

It is one of our frequent delusions that, because ideas come before things and accomplishments, because a living idea is a mighty power in the world, the expression of ideas in words is the highest activity that man is capable of. We have come to think of the truth as a certain order of words. We are wrong. Ideas are born of personalities and can only find their full expression there. The truth is to be lived. As Whitman says, "He is greatest who contributes the greatest original practical example."

The claim of the prologue to the fourth gospel is that the intention of God in fulfilment of which all things were created, which had not found full expression either in things or sensations or thoughts, was at last manifested in a human personality. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Only prejudice, one thinks, would forbid the examination of so promising a claim as that.

CHAPTER III

THE HERO OF HEROES

"He masters whose Spirit masters ; he tastes sweetest who results sweetest in the long run."—WHITMAN.

IN view of the statement with which the last chapter closed we turn with some hope to the story of Jesus. Let us be clear as to the object of our search. We are not looking for what we may conceive to be a morally perfect character, though the character of Jesus has exhausted the praise of men. We are looking for the most vital and complete personality. For that purpose we need only to start with the undeniable fact that no other person has produced such an effect upon men. A park orator exclaimed, "Who was Jesus after all? A person of no importance whatever!" The correct answer came from the crowd. "Why can't you let Him alone then?"

From His first public appearance Jesus has been a sword dividing men, He who came to be a reconciler. No personality has been so much or so eagerly discussed, or is, even now. The very books of those who attack Him most fiercely are dated from the reputed year of His birth, and bear witness on the title page and in the contents that no one has left such an abiding impression on the world. Of none other who ever lived can it be said that millions are convinced that He is still alive and still a presence of help and good cheer. Even if they are quite wrong it is amazing.

Every possible theory has been put forward to account for His personality, even the most preposterous. I have read a book which proposed to account for Jesus by the theory that He must have had a fall and injured His head in His youth! That way to greatness, however, has not gained many adherents. What I think must surely be the last tribute to the greatness of Jesus has been seriously offered in our own day. He has been explained away. "There never weren't no such person." He is too overwhelming to be credible.

Not only His enemies, but His friends have found themselves in difficulties. He is so various, so many-sided, that men are continually bringing to light some aspect of His life and making it the explanation of everything. He is a profound mystic—and all else has been added by stupid and commonplace people. He is a social reformer—and the rest was invented by the theologians. He is a violent apocalyptic herald—and the rest was added when the expectations He aroused were not fulfilled as men expected. He is the Man of Sorrows. He is the preacher of a new discipline, the discipline of joy. He is a revolutionist. He is the peace giver. He is a voice calling to adventure and pain. He is the most human of the children of men. He is God. Something can be said for all these, and a great deal for most of them.

It was on the personality rather than the teaching of Jesus that the Church gave its verdict. Emerson complains that the Church has dwelt with noxious exaggeration on the person of Jesus. All the more encouraging to us on our quest. It is a great and impressive personality we are looking for. The first importance of the gospel story for us is that it enshrines such a personality and enables us to gather something of the impression that Jesus made upon

those who tell His story. We will turn to it as we might take up any other biography.

Jesus is pictured for us there as setting out into public life under the obligation of a great mission. We may say, for the present, that He felt it to be His business to show men that all their most wonderful dreams of the perfection of human life and personality sprang from an impulse that was God given, and that the face of the world might be changed whenever men were willing. To change the face of the world is a large enough mission, and when we go on to consider the means Jesus proposed to use the wonder grows. Such ways as greatness or ambition had hitherto used to impress its will upon the world He dismissed as stupid and beneath Him. That is the meaning of the Temptation. The Nietzschean type of "great man" He judged, not with envy or malice, but with humour, and so, from above. "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their oppressors are styled *Benefactors!*"* He saw, behind the swagger, the parasite accepting "with a good conscience the sacrifice of a legion of individuals who, for its sake, must be suppressed and reduced to imperfect men, to slaves and instruments."†

Yet with the sense of a mission and of His own place in it beyond that which has overturned the reason of lesser men, He remains sane and wholesome. He moves deliberately to the end, turned aside neither by the misunderstandings of friends, the malice of foes, nor by any inducement to take an easier way or to snatch a cheap success.

When dark days come and the price of faithfulness to His convictions is that of apparent failure, His personality stands out none the less. Indignity cannot demean Him, and what would be the story

* *Twentieth Century, N.T.*

† *Beyond Good and Evil, 258.*

of a sordid criminal execution shines with the lustre He sheds over it. His disciples, on their own showing, are torn between adoration and bewilderment, but they cling to Him as a drowning sailor to a rock, and their dismay at the end is as though a rock had suddenly crumbled in their hands. He was so big, so strong, that this was incredible. There can be few things harder than to have to defeat the expectations of one's own friends.

Later on, when they were convinced, reasonably or not, that He was still alive, Peter tried to explain how it had come about. He gives the very explanation which our quest demands, though he had not our word. It was a question of Personality. He had overcome death "because it was not possible that He should be holden of it."

"But I cannot accept the Resurrection!"

Then you really mean that Christianity promises so much to Personality that it is incredible. At least then, what a personality this must have been that it seemed credible of Him.

Moreover, Jesus is represented throughout the stories as showing a like power in overcoming other things that limit life, as a healer of the bodies, minds and spirits of men. He awakens new life in them.

The sick, in one way or another, Jesus found on every hand. He is too great to despise such. It is the parvenu, not too sure of his own position, who insists so tremendously on the gap between himself and those beneath. The great spirit does not need that others should be merely "slaves and instruments" to hold it up. And Jesus had this further reason. He did not despise, because he could heal. "It is only those whom we do not despise that we are able to elevate. Moral contempt is a far greater indignity and insult than any kind of crime."*

* Nietzsche. *Will to Power*, 740.

This is not the place to argue for miracles, but there is enough contemporary evidence of remarkable acts of healing to put out of court the man who says that such things are not possible. The impression produced by the story is that of one possessing not, as is the case with most, too little or barely enough personality to meet the demands and possibilities of life for himself, but with such a reserve, such an overflow indeed, that in this presence others looked for healing and found it. That overflow of rich personality is what Christianity means by love. Love is a word so vilely treated and so reeking with sentimentalism that one hesitates to use it. When asked to define love it is well to remember that it depends upon the lover. The love of Jesus was the sign and bestowal of a rich personality.

The works of healing are acts of love and faith, the latter also being dependent upon personality for its vitality. Other things being equal, the biggest man sees farthest and so, as Whitman has it, has most faith. Intensity of vision may stand for a definition of faith.

The disciples saw the epileptic boy and heard the sad story afterwards told to Jesus, but they could not conjure up the picture of *that* boy restored to health. Jesus saw it, was able to make even the trembling father see it. And what by faith He saw, by love He made real.

One more instance of healing from the fourth gospel. It may be history or parable or both. To the cripple in the arches of Bethesda Jesus said, "Willest thou to be made whole?"

It is indeed a parable this of human nature, desirous of life, impatient of things that limit, sure inwardly that these things should not be, yet not sure enough, hopeful always that some chance of freedom will come, waiting on a "miracle" from outside, and not

able to take advantage of it even if it should come. No doubt the poor fellow had received a lot of pity in his time, but no one had spoken to him in this way. He could but stammer,

“ Sir, I have no man ”

But Jesus has already seen this man walking home with his bed. His personality overflows upon this weakling, bathes him in power, lifts him up. In the cripple's mind grows an idea. “ I can ! ” and he does.

Whatever we may decide to think about the possibility of these things, they do give us the impression Jesus made upon those who knew Him. He is the kind of person about whom such stories can fitly be told. They fall naturally into place in His life. There is no seeking after the dramatic, the prodigious or the terrifying. One has but to compare these stories with such miracles as are ascribed to the Hindu gods and sages, or with those attributed to Jesus in the apocryphal gospels, to see the gulf between them. Even the Old Testament miracles are, for the most part, on quite a different level. Jesus moves about quite simply and unaffectedly, and His works of mercy are done in the day's round, and with no idea of convincing men by any appeal to their sense of mystery. His appeal is in quite other directions. But, where He can find response in another personality, He can join forces with the faith of the other for healing. That He was so often able to create that faith in others is a tribute to His personality. There was that in Him as well as in His words which “ spake with authority.”

This power is shown in other ways than in acts of healing. In the one act recorded of Jesus which can in any way be called an act of violence, the surprising part of the story seems to be little noticed. We see Him taking up the whip of rushes and driving

the cattle and sheep out of the temple courts. We see the money lenders scrambling for their scattered coins. And we are so anxious to laugh at the picture—I dare say the crowd laughed, but not Jesus,—or either to apologise for His “righteous indignation” or point triumphantly to His “ill temper,” that we forget to ask the question, “Why did they let Him do it?” He was only one among a crowd. The only answer is that there was that in Jesus which held their hand. When His enemies at last did strike, what a picture of the business it was to take one poor man!

And He was poor, a nobody, so far as ordinary valuations go. It was naked and unaided personality that drew men about Him. The young man of great wealth, the Roman centurion, the ruler of the Jews and others are represented quite casually as seeking the help and counsel of this poor young man who was anybody’s guest, and who was on terms of affectionate familiarity with the lowest characters of the country side.

The tax gatherer who has piled up money finds Him such an irresistible puzzle that he is not above climbing a tree merely to get a good look at Him. Imagine some wealthy and well-known citizen of your own town climbing a lamp post to see a working man agitator go by! But that is the kind of impression Jesus produced. And it is to be remembered that His public life was spread over three years at the most.

Negatively, Jesus appears to be free from the weaknesses and trivialities which beset others, even the greatest. I am not arguing from what is left out of the story, but from the story as it stands. His absolute singleness of purpose is astonishing. Only those who have never sought to bend all their energies to one line can miss it. There is no division between self-culture and service, no sign of any

difficulty in settling what was due to Himself and what was due to others. Nor is there anything merely local or provincial. There is no reason to suppose that in many things He did not share the knowledge of His time, but He seems in no way to be limited by that. He did perfectly the thing He came to do. He can say at the end, "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do."

Accept it broadly, as a human story. There has never been anything quite like it. Great personalities there have been who have affected those about them more by what they were than by anything that they did. It is said that Garibaldi produced such an impression on many people. Whitman also seems to have had a great unconscious power over those amongst whom he moved. When those who felt his influence most want to say the highest thing they can about him, they suggest that he was a second Jesus. But nobody has died for Whitman yet.

What are we to think of it? Make any allowance we wish for the growth of legend, accretions of the miraculous, exaggeration of story tellers and the like, and still the impression of a tremendous personality remains, the completest and most vital that has ever walked the earth. If there is anywhere a "divine word" of guidance on our great quest, this is the likeliest place to find it, the more so as we find that the task He set himself was the interpreting and answering of our demand upon life. He deals with the very thing we are in search of.

It is said sometimes that the last man to understand the principles and tendencies of his own work is the genius himself. He can create, but he cannot explain, and, when he tries to do so, makes a bungling job of it. Jesus might be a triumphant personality Himself, and yet so entirely have misread the meaning of His own life and spirit that His teaching, if carried

out, would be subversive of life and, as has been said, a fatality. Indeed, the statement is made roundly that Christianity "denies life."* Nietzsche affirms this over many pages, in which his voice rises almost to a shriek. "Christianity is a degenerative movement, consisting of all kinds of decaying and excremental elements."† He bids us hold our noses as we look into the dim cellar where the deadly Christian ideals are manufactured.‡ His followers support him, and even outdo him. Mr. J. M. Kennedy, in his book on Nietzsche, gives us scripture to prove this assertion, culminating in the alleged quotation from the words of Jesus, "He that loveth life shall lose it, and he that hateth life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." Mr. Kennedy ought to be a little more exact in his quotations, especially when he is basing an attack upon them, for that is not what Jesus said. And, had he turned another page or so over, he would have found a more pregnant saying on the matter in dispute: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Here, at any rate, we find Jesus definitely ranged on the side of life.

He was on the side of life in all He said, all He did, all He was.

It is important that we should recognise the fact that all these go together. If the genius cannot explain himself it is a defect, or a limitation at the least. Jesus not only lived, but set out to teach men the secret of life. Conversely, Jesus not only taught, He is the practical example of what His teaching means. He is greater than His words, though He does not contradict them. He is not only the best commentary but the necessary commentary on what He said, a thing theologians, as well as others, have

* *Will to Power*, 351.

† *Ibid*, 154.

‡ *Genealogy of Morals*, I., 14.

too frequently forgotten. The teaching of Jesus has been taken out of the story and held up as a thing apart, sometimes for our admiration, as in the case of Tolstoy, sometimes for our rejection, as in the case of Nietzsche, sometimes merely to be watered down and made palatable by pious commentators who, while they did not hesitate to ascribe deity to Jesus, yet thought they knew the possibilities of life better than He did.

The life of Tolstoy, to whom the world owes so much, makes sad reading at times, most of all when we see that last pitiful attempt to clear himself of the web of compromise that ever seemed to choke his search for the good. The impression left on the mind is, that if this is Christianity, it is a pathetic failure under ordinary conditions of life. Is not the reason just this, that Tolstoy took the letter of the words of Jesus as being the whole of His message?

Nietzsche, when he could for a moment see past "that pernicious blockhead, Paul," found a figure which commanded his respect, but it is clear that he did not read the words of Jesus in the light of His personality or think such a course to be at all necessary.

Yet there is no other reasonable way, not because what Jesus said is not true, or because His life denies or refutes it, but simply because Jesus did not set out to lay down a fool-proof system, with carefully defined terms and the verbal exactness of a philosopher. He was not making a new "law," which in itself shows the value He set upon Personality and His desire for its free and full development. He cut the leading strings and would have men act from within. He had a profound faith in human possibilities, but found them overlaid and smothered. His aim was not so much to convince the mind as to quicken the spirit. He awakes the dead and gives the word, "Loose him and let him go!"

Jesus spoke about the greatest things in parables and pictures such as would strike the imagination. Where there were meanings hidden, it was because words would not stretch to them. The tree is hidden in the seed, but it will appear in due time if the soil be kindly. All the more reason to know the speaker, if this was His method. A phrase from the lips of a stranger that leaves us cold may be startling enough from a known friend, or it may be the other way about.

What we have to do then, if the personality of Jesus makes any appeal to us, is first of all to see if we can discover what it was which made Jesus the powerful and overflowing personality He was, and whether His secret is at all available for us.

CHAPTER IV

SONS OF GOD

"It is our claim that this life had significance for the right interpretation of human personality. . . . It is the revelation of what lies behind our humanity, the solution of what disturbs us so mightily, and it was intended to found a new race on a new conception of human nature."—DR. ORCHARD.

WHEN we look at Jesus again with regard to our last questions, we see that what most distinguishes Him from those amongst whom He moves is the vividness of His apprehension of God. He never argues the point or explains it. That God was His Father, that He was able to be sure of His will, was not to Him a matter of report or of argument. God was present to His consciousness in such wise that He had no doubt about it whatever. In His teaching He seems to assume that what, in this respect, is true of Himself is true of others, or may be, if they will recognise it. It only needs pointing out, and at once men will, with a glad surprise, set about doing what the Father does.

Now one would think that this would be good news to men, unless it be true, as I think Mr. G. K. Chesterton has said, that men cannot bear to be reminded that they are sons of God. It ought at any rate to be good news to us who are seeking the way to Personality, and have already found that we cannot explain that growing thing in us, except by supposing that it is itself an expression of the Creative Will, and that its final achievement is the

end of the creative process. Good news it is, surely, if, the completest expression of Personality that the world has been was due to a more perfect realisation of something which we see to be the truth about ourselves. And if it were not the truth about ourselves, we should hardly be able to see it as the truth about Jesus.

All that remains then is that I should live like a son of God!

Truly, that is all. It is the whole secret, just as the secret of painting masterpieces is merely the choosing of the right colours and putting them in the right place. It is here that we find the gap between knowing that a thing is so as a fact of the mind and realising that it is so as a fact of the consciousness. Then there is the further difficulty of implicitly obeying what the awakened consciousness suggests. It is much like the difference between the appreciator and the creator of beauty. Our only hope is that somehow Jesus will be able to bridge this gap for us. At all events, He *knew*. How He came to know we are not told. That there was some development in His knowledge is suggested, but from the beginning He is set before us as sure that He knew the Father. To say that He was deluded is to condemn ourselves to life in a world where delusion can produce not only more powerful, but more lasting and more life-giving effects than sanity. Bad as the world may be, I am not prepared to believe that about it.

We have reached a point at which I must make a digression. We must settle the question as to how we are going to regard the "supernatural." We cannot look at the story of Jesus without seeing what a great part this plays in it. The miracles of healing have already been referred to. They are sometimes explained as being mere cases of mental healing, though just how that *explains* them is difficult to

see. We must be clear ■■ to what we mean by the "supernatural." There are many who are quite ready to take Jesus as the one sufficient guide to life, but they have decided against the possible appearance of the supernatural in the order with which we have to do. Man is the child of nature, and natural laws are uniform and changeless.

Now I am quite clear that what we call the "supernatural," cannot be left out of the life of Jesus, for I have tried to do it. My first aim in writing this book was to show that the teaching of Jesus about life represented the wisest, the surest, and finally, the only successful way of achieving Personality. I would merely argue from the teaching to the type of personality which obedience to it would result in. It was to be a simple tract on common sense ethics. Does not Nietzsche tell us, "Christianity is still possible at any moment. It is not bound to any one of the impudent dogmas that have adorned themselves with its name. Christianity is a method of life, not a system of belief."* There is very much truth in that, though it depends upon which impudent dogmas one means. But, to cut the story short, I got along on my proposed method, with considerable difficulties here and there, until I had written the greater part of what I had set out to say. Then the whole thing broke down, finally and irretrievably broke down. It was not the miracles that broke it down. It was Jesus Himself. I turned back to see that the teaching of Jesus about conduct is ■■ much interwoven with His idea of the supernatural—not necessarily with mine—as the stories of the miracles. I had to begin again.

A little reflection shows where the mistake lies. We look to Jesus as the personality beyond all others. That means, we find a consciousness of union with

* *Will to Power*, 212.

God beyond that of others. If that is anything more than a pious phrase, it means that Jesus will express in a way beyond others something of the Creative Will, or the Life Force, or whatever we choose to call the power behind phenomena. Have we acquired the right to say what that will mean in practice? Only one thing can give us that right, that is equality of personality, equality of consciousness of our union with the Creative Will. We see Jesus was conscious of such union; we expect Him to show us in His personality what that means, but then we go on to assume that He must show us what *we* think it means. Surely it is only reasonable to say that what Jesus finds it to mean is the important thing. We shall never learn if we assume that we know already, or that our knowledge of the nature of things is exhaustive. Instead of setting up our idea of God and of what is possible to Personality and then cutting Jesus down to fit, would it not be wiser to revise our ideas of God and of Personality? I think so.

It seems clear that Jesus was aware of and used resources beyond ordinary experience, but the miracles are only one way in which He did that. His whole teaching is based on the idea that, because men were sons of God, resources of another order than the "natural" were open to them, and that by these their personalities might be immeasurably enriched. Why should we assume, as we so often do, that there are yet boundless advances possible in the natural order, but none in the realm of Personality, which is the spiritual order? The Personality of Jesus is our assurance that there are new possibilities there. What other kind of assurance could we have? This is not to argue for all the miracles in the lump, or for any particular miracle. The evidence for each one must be judged on its merits. But it is to say

that we have no right to consider that the last word has been said when we declare for the uniformity of nature, meaning the nature that we have had experience of through our physical senses, and decide that no higher modes of action are possible. The super-natural is not the unnatural, nor the contra-natural, nor the lawless, but just literally the super-natural. We are ourselves a compound of the natural and the supernatural. That is why we fit the world indifferently. We are too big. Our difficulty is that of the angel in Mr. H. G. Wells' *The Wonderful Visit*,—to get our wings tucked away under the habiliments of ordinary or natural life.

The message of Jesus was that what we call the supernatural is already in our possession and awaits our further claims upon it. "Supernatural" is our word, not His. He spoke of His works as signs, as hints that the wise would take. We shall come to this again as we go on to consider the end that Jesus set before men, but this digression was necessary here that we might be clear as to where we stand.

We go back then to the point at which we broke off, the fact that Jesus knew God and was in union with Him, that this consciousness was no series of gleams, but a steady light, burning and shining, in which He continually walked. It may be that what Jesus found in His consciousness we may find in ours if we look, that the difference between Him and us is mainly, if not altogether, that He recognised as the presence and voice of God and wholly trusted to what we have felt and not recognised or not trusted, or perhaps have fled from lest it should arise and command our whole life and perhaps lead us out into an adventure to which we fear to commit ourselves. We know that we could not only do more, but be more, if we dare. Certainly Jesus spoke to men **■** if they had some sure knowledge of God in

themselves. "If ye . . . how much more your heavenly Father." One is finite and stained with evil, the other infinite and perfect, but if we find that something in God is also in ourselves, we have found the presence of God, if we will but recognise it. Jesus told men to trust the Father, to live as sons of the Father, He rallied them on the smallness of their faith, and some few He led into a greater trust, a nearer realisation than they had dreamed of as possible. Yet it remains true that He found no faith like His own, no such clear and untroubled consciousness, no such glad obedience. It would seem that He had come to this conclusion before He appeared as a teacher, and that it was the lack of such vision on the part of others which at last brought Him to the conclusion that He was not only a son of God, but *the* Son of God, the Christ whom His people had long looked for, the Divine Man who should be a deliverer to His race.

The creeds have gone farther than this, as we know. They speak of God the Son, Very God of Very God. I do not in the least dispute their finding. But there is little in the story of Jesus to suggest that He was conscious of being God the Son, nor, if we accept the verdict of faith about Him, do we need to hold that He was different in "substance" to ourselves. I cannot myself easily attach any intelligible meaning to the idea of a difference in substance. It is a term belonging to past ways of thinking. Jesus stands immeasurably above us, the supreme embodiment of the Creative Will in a human personality, but the presence of God in Him cannot be essentially different from His presence in other human personalities. To evoke it in others was His mission. William Law tells us, "If Christ was to raise a new life like His own in every man, then every man must have had originally, in the inmost spirit of his life, a seed of Christ."

We have agreed that the full development of Personalities is the end of the creative purpose and process. Paul tells us the same thing in different terms. "The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God."

If God can unite with a human personality, there must be in Him something corresponding to humanity and something in us corresponding to divinity. There is no other reasonable explanation of what Personality means. We are, as it has been put, the first step from the animal to the divine. Only the first step, but still, the first step has been taken. That is something to lift up the heart with the joy of being alive. "We have positively appeared!"

How Jesus dealt with the likeness and the difference He found between Himself and others we must now consider.

CHAPTER V

THE SON OF MAN

"No man can resist himself, the pursuit of his own interests, of his own idea; can resist the coming of the Son of Man, of the true Superman who is Lord over the Self."—ROBERT GARDNER.

JESUS found that He stood alone in His consciousness of union with God, so much so, that He accepted as His mission the work of revealing the Father to men. To bring men up to His level of vision, into the divine way of life befitting sons of God, was a great and worthy task. It was enough that the disciple should become as his master.

Is it finally enough? We have been told that there is little hope for us if we are finally satisfied with Jesus. Did He not live the life of a provincial Jew, a long while ago? However universal His appeal may be, His actual life was lived in a smaller world than ours, smaller in size, smaller in the reach and complexity of its activities. There are those, for example, to whom art is everything, their meat and drink. What did Jesus know of art? Or of literature, statecraft, or science? What conception could He have of the way in which invention and discovery were to enlarge the scope of life and the field in which Personality was to find expression? Granting that His consciousness of God set Him immeasurably above others of His time, and even above us, not was the limited, simple life a necessity for such consciousness to be possible? Was not its intensity due to its narrowness? Would the same consciousness have

equal validity in our day and in our complex life? Does Jesus represent the final possibility, and if He does, shall we not have to conclude that all our activities, beyond such as He engaged in, are but a vain attempt to build a new tower of Babel? Have they no real meaning for life and Personality at all? We feel that they have, or at least ought to have. How then can Jesus be a sufficient guide or a worthy ideal, seeing there are so many issues He never dealt with?

Doubts to the world's child heart unknown
 Question us now from star and stone;
 The power is lost to self-deceive
 With hollow forms of make-believe;
 Still struggles in the age's breast,
 With deepening agony of quest,
 The old enquiry, "Art Thou He?"*

Let us, we might reasonably conclude, cease looking back. We must be forward lookers—forward to that dim all-conquering figure of the future, the Messiah yet to come, the Superman!

We might so conclude, as some have done, if we did not look a little more deeply. Then we find that we have taken rather too much for granted. Can we take it for granted that the man who rides an aeroplane is essentially different from his ancestor who rode an ass, or even that our varied knowledge and complex activities have really enlarged our personalities? No doubt they have increased the field of activity for them, but that is another matter. Is not a great part of our modern troubles due to the fact that, in vulgar slang, we have bitten off more than we can chew? At any point in the progress of man, the most important thing is that he should be in touch with God. Jesus made it His mission to lead men to that. It is final.

* Whittier: *The Meeting*.

Then we may have forgotten that, since the personality even more than the words of Jesus is to be our guide, it does not follow that because He did not mention some of our problems, say those pertaining to modern industrial conditions, He can shed no light upon them. He said nothing about slavery, but He killed it, and if it was a long time dying, it was only because there is no element of coercion about what Jesus shows us. We accept or reject at our will, but we come to His solution at the end.

And, on the other side, there is nothing in all that Jesus said or did which is opposed to the widest exercise of every human gift or the continual conquest of the material world, and, on the Christian interpretation of Jesus, everything to encourage us.

It is to be noticed also that Jesus Himself looked forward and bade us look forward beyond the limitations under which He found Himself to a time when they should be transcended. We are not to look back to Jesus in the flesh as the final measure of human possibility in all the details of life. It is not the imitation of Jesus that is our business, but the application of His Spirit to the life and problems of our own day. It is part of His greatness that He refused to be "a judge and divider over men," and consistently refrained from laying down rules which would have been of local and temporary application. We look back to Jesus to take our bearings. We look back as the student continually refers back to the principles and axioms with which he started. We find in Jesus, in His attitude to the Father, in His revelation of the Father, the true way of life in all circumstances, however complex, but we also look forward, as He looked forward, to the final revelation, the ultimate victory of the Son of Man, beside whom the Nietzschean Superman is but a pale ghost.

Who is this Son of Man ?

Superman is but a new name for a very old idea—like most of Nietzsche's discoveries. I am not making the mistake which Mr. Bernard Shaw found so galling in relation to his play, *Man and Superman*. I am not thinking of the ethical Superman, the "just man made perfect," but of a vastly greater figure, dimly appearing in the prophetic dreams of the Hebrew scriptures, the brooding over which no doubt suggested to Jesus the name which He so commonly uses, apparently of Himself.

Apparently, for that is a question. Was Jesus speaking of Himself when He named the Son of Man? If of Himself, was it of Himself as an individual merely, or in some representative way, as a man might speak for the firm which employs him?

It is likely that Jesus took not only the title, but something of the content He put into it, from phrases and hints He found in the reading of the Jewish scriptures and in other more nearly contemporary writings, of which the Book of Enoch is a type. In that book the Son of Man appears as the expected deliverer of His people. This is not so in the canonical writings, though the hints of it are there. But in the Scriptures proper, Jesus found the idea of man created for dominion over all creation, but alas, too often appearing in practice as the slave, and not the master, of things and circumstances, "bound, who should conquer; slaves, who should be kings." Amid the pictures which alternate between sorrow over things as they are and rapture over what might be, nay, must be, if God rules, there appears a figure, now seemingly a man who shall be like "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land," now as something more than an individual man, an ideal race, now as one who takes upon himself the burden of a bewildered people and by his sufferings redeems them.

The ideas left on the mind might be phrased, "Nothing is too good to be true of man, if only we had the right Man to show us the way." Desire, mingled with hope and promise, glows and fades and glows again as we read. God will somehow express Himself in a Man, and then all will be well. But such a Man, the Messiah, the Christ, the Chosen One, will have to be of a type far beyond the specimens of His race which have hitherto appeared. He will be Superman, at least.

"Such a man would be, in the very truest sense, the son of the race in its most normal racial working, the pattern of mankind, the fruit of all effort after right, the vindication of the instinctive belief in its possibility—in the very highest sense the Son of Man."*

Was this the place that Jesus, finding Himself unique in His consciousness of the Father, decided He must occupy? It is clear that it was so, but there are varying interpretations of His use of this title which are held to be contradictory of each other. They may be summed up as follows.

"Son of Man" means :

I, myself.

Man generally.

Ideal Man : Typical Man : Representative Man.

Messiah, present or to come.

These interpretations can all find sayings to support them, but none of them cover all the cases in which Jesus used the phrase. If I may venture an opinion where doctors differ, it is that all these interpretations represent bits of the truth about the consciousness of Jesus.

He was speaking for Himself when He used the title, Son of Man, but not about Himself alone and separate. Personality to Jesus was certainly not "that self-

* *Voluntas Dei*, 102.

hood which shuts itself up against everything else." So much personality came into consciousness in Him that He was able to reach down to that depth—or up to that height—where our personality is in union with something altogether vaster, the ground of all personalities. He drew His life from that, and was able not only to show to the world the greatest personality it has known, but to speak for man in a universal way.

He speaks for that *Man* in men who, He believed, is the image of God, the Messiah, the Christ, "the Real Self of every being growing into consciousness through the life and struggle of the race."*

The fourth gospel puts it that Jesus was the fullest expression possible under human limitations of the eternal thought of God, of the light that lighteth every man. In the terms we have been using, the fullest expression of complete human personality and the prophecy of all that might be. For the Son of Man has yet to be fully revealed and to triumph over all those sub-human powers which are yet so manifest in ourselves and find their expression in the evils that beset us. The writer of the letter to the Hebrews reminds us of the statement in the eighth Psalm, which tells that man was created to have dominion, and he goes on:—"We see not yet all things under dominion to him, but we see . . . Jesus, . . . crowned with glory and honour," the assurance to all men, that is, of the dominion for which they were created.

We conclude, then, that in calling Himself the Son of Man, Jesus was speaking in a symbolical way of that which He found in Himself and saw to be universal, the final truth about all men. But it was so completely and uniquely present in His own case that He could identify Himself with it. There was no

* Robert Gardner: *In the Heart of Democracy*.

division between Jesus and the Christ. From henceforth He is Jesus Christ, the New Adam, the incarnate presence of God in our race, the symbol of the Christ within us, of our true Personality. He reveals God to me, but He is also "the Interpreter of myself to myself."

CHAPTER VI

THE CHRISTIAN END

Kingdom of God

"IF one is clear as to the 'wherefore' of one's life," says Nietzsche, "then the 'how' can take care of itself." When we ask for Nietzsche's "wherefore" his followers point us to the Superman, but Nietzsche himself looked beyond him, and gives us for our final vision his doctrine of Eternal Recurrence, which immediately negatives any value his "yea-saying" to life may have had. Its utter hopelessness may be left to the imagination. Even Nietzsche's adulators find themselves in difficulty over it. That there is finally no progress at all, that all the tragedies of the earth and the unnameable torments men have inflicted upon one another are to recur again eternally, is the last word of despair. No wonder if the "horror of his teaching," as Mr. Kennedy puts it, had much to do with Nietzsche's final madness.

In contrast, Christianity, which we are told denies life, looks for the eternal and ever progressive life of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus did not invent the phrase, but He made it the ground of His message to men. He set before them an end which in their hearts they all wanted, making a positive appeal to those deep impulses in men which He believed to be the voice of God. Response to that appeal is a "yea-saying" to the Will to Personality.

Jesus found the phrase in use as the brief summary of that perfect commonwealth which is the constantly

recurring dream of the Hebrew prophets, now as ideal state, now as the ideal Jerusalem, now as life under the ideal king. It meant an end of the things that thwart and cripple men's lives and, on the positive side, a life of joyous fulness. In a word, *Utopia*, conceived, as we might expect, under Hebrew forms and expressed in Hebrew phrases.

But are not Utopias the refuge of the impotent and despairing? Hardly so. Neither the impotent nor despairing are given to set out for themselves a picture which means progress to a great end. Utopias are mostly the work of people of constructive powers who, by the dulness or apathy of men, are hindered in their work. In any case, it is not a Hebrew dream only, it is a race dream, this of the perfect world order in which all lives have free scope for expression and growth. That the Jews called their dream the Kingdom of God witnesses to the greatness of their conception of God.

Now in speaking of the Kingdom of God, Jesus must have meant some such thing as the prophets had meant and the people to whom He addressed Himself understood by that term. Otherwise there was no point in His using it at all. This needs some emphasis, as it has been thought that Jesus meant something entirely different from those to whom He spoke, and it was this which created the misunderstanding that finally proved fatal. This "something different" has been held to comprise the real message of Jesus, a message of quietism, of escape from the world, of a kingdom altogether inward, and, too often, a little haven of refuge into which the soul could creep and be safe. It is just that type of Christianity which deserves—if any does—some of the scorn which Nietzsche poured upon Christianity in general, and it is to be noted that this was Nietzsche's own interpretation of the Kingdom of God. "The Kingdom

of Heaven is a state of the heart. . . . a change of feeling in the individual."*

This is by no means all that Jesus meant. We shall see that it is not only reasonable but quite correct to assume that Jesus spoke to be understood, and did not mean any less than the people understood, though it is not unlikely that He meant much more, since the idea moved Him as it had moved none else.

What was the Kingdom of God to Jesus? We do not want a definition of the phrase, but the ideas for which it stood. Had Jesus appeared in our own day it is possible that He would have chosen some quite different figure to express His meaning. He took the best at His disposal, recognising its limitations. Such sayings as "My kingdom is not of this world," do not mean that what He stood for had no relation to this world, but that, as the world counted kingdoms, His was not a kingdom at all, for it did not depend on those things without which they could not exist. It is a spiritual order.

In that sense, also, it is not an "external" kingdom, but as it is the realisation of the life which is God's intention for men, it is obvious that no external thing will be unaffected by it. Environment is the expression of Personality and faithfully reflects it. The Kingdom is ultimately the complete transformation of life by the elimination of all that hinders it, and its full development to—"it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

There is another error which must be noted. An antithesis between "this world" and the "other world," between "this life and eternity" has been created in some Christian teaching which does not exist in the thought of Jesus. That anyone should be advised, as we sometimes have been, to cease thinking of this life and to devote the attention to

* *Will to Power*, 161.

eternity, is merely silly, since this life is ■■ much a part of eternity as any other. "One life at a time," is ■ motto to which I think Jesus would not have objected. And the common idea in the contrast between "this world" and the "world to come" is largely due to imperfect translation. Jesus said literally, "this age" and "the age to come." There is no necessary reference to any other part of space than that which we at present occupy. To use a wise distinction made by Professor Hogg,* we are to be "unworldly," but by no means "other-worldly." What Jesus thought was the lot of those who laid down this earthly life is another question, but the prayer He taught His disciples hinges on the words, "Thy kingdom come . . . on earth."

What good things did He include in this? Speaking to men for whom the phrase had vivid meaning, He did not need to indulge in description. We gather his idea from what He did and the significance He attached to His doings. He healed men, their broken bodies, their crushed spirits, their discordant personalities. That sums up His work as He went to and from Galilee and Judæa. He did not work miracles to convince unbelievers, but refused to do so. He did, however, consider that His works were signs which the wise should notice, and from which they might gather that the good thing they desired was possible and awaited their united willingness. Signs ■■ sure as the budding leaf is the sign and promise of summer.

It is quite clear from the whole attitude of Jesus towards sin, mental disarrangement and disease that He thought of these things as definitely evil, ■■ things to be overcome. Why evil? Because they stand in the way of that fulness of life and complete Personality which is the birthright of man as the child

* *Christ's Message of the Kingdom.*

of God. The Kingdom of God is the inheritance of that birthright.

The perfect order waits on the willingness of men. It is the gift of God, as the Jews believed, but, as they did not realise, it is still dependent upon man, on His willingness to take the right way, to put His gifts to the right use. For God coerces none. To those who thought that "the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear," Jesus told the story of the pounds. The man who reckoned the conditions hard, who did not see why He should labour for another or live for any but self, is the failure of the story. The way to fullest life is not by hoarding, but by spending, not by hiding the pound in a napkin, but by letting it circulate.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in *A Modern Utopia*, emphasises the distinction between what he calls the static and the dynamic conceptions of the perfect community. One is a flat perfection in which change can only be for the worse. The other leaves room for growth. It need hardly be said that the Kingdom of God is of the dynamic order. Its establishment on earth is but the beginning, for we have no reason to suppose that its reach is bounded by the life of the body, or that those who live for its realisation and leave the body before that day—as most of us probably will—are shut out from its joys. Perhaps, as Sir Oliver Lodge suggests, we go upstairs to rule a planet! If that be so, the Kingdom of God will reach there also.

But now let it be said with equal emphasis that the Kingdom of God is an inward Kingdom, and a present possession for those who unite themselves with the Will of God. That was the experience of Jesus, an experience which He is able to communicate to others. He showed men in Himself and in His teaching that since that perfect order does not await

the willingness of God, but only the readiness of men, its powers are to some extent manifest and realisable now in human personalities. Not the perfect kingdom, for all that it means will take all men to know and show, but there is now possible for men a fulness of life and an enrichment of Personality which is the promise of a life eternal, in which every possibility shall have room to develop as the Kingdom of God is more and more completely realised. Eternal life is not merely the endless prolongation of existence, but existence of such a quality that it cannot be destroyed. It is the true personal life, which will survive the assault of death upon the body as that of Jesus did. "*Eternal Life and Kingdom of God* are names for the same idea, the former expressing it in terms of personal possession, and the latter in terms of the thing possessed,"* and, it may be added, of the order in which it finds expression.

The Kingdom of God then, is yet to come, but its powers and possibilities may be entered upon now, just as Jesus was at once Son of Man in His consciousness of God, and yet looked forward to a final victory of the Son of Man which should be our victory too. One makes the other possible. An order imposed upon men from without would be a misfit. A purely inward order in which there was no hope for the world as such would be the handing over of the world to the forces of destruction. The way of Jesus avoids both those fatalities.

Immovably certain that God was His Father, He claimed sonship on behalf of all, and with it the world order and fulness of life and Personality that such sonship demands. His teaching about the conduct of life is a setting forth of those values which make for and express this type of life, and will finally realise it in the Kingdom of God.

* Hogg: *Christ's Message of the Kingdom.*

PART II

THE CHRISTIAN TYPE

"Are Christian morals worth anything, or are they a profanation and an outrage?"—NIETZSCHE.

"Christianity was the first expression of world religion, the first complete repudiation of tribalism and war and disputation. The common sense of mankind has toiled through two thousand years of chastening experience to find at last how sound a meaning attaches to the familiar phrases of the Christian faith."—H. G. WELLS.

CHAPTER I

THE BEATITUDES

THE Sermon on the Mount is our main statement of Christian values, so far as the teaching of Jesus goes. We must be clear, however, from the commencement, that it is not a manual of rules. It is very unlikely that it represents a single discourse. It is a compilation of aphorisms and counsels which seem to have been given as occasion demanded, though one or more brief discourses may form the backbone of it.

Jesus did not give such detailed instruction in behaviour as John the Baptist is represented as giving to the soldiers and publicans at their request. Rather He emphasises the spirit in which life is to be lived, sometimes positively, sometimes negatively as need arose. But Christian morality is not "negative morality," and so far as morality means the keeping of rules, it is not morality at all. There is nothing in the teaching of Jesus in the style of those who would "draw a line and make other chaps toe it."

On the other hand, there is nothing abstract about what Jesus has to say. He never tells us vaguely to do the right or try to be good, though I have heard it said that the sum of all Jesus has to say is, "Be good." Which is not true. He was asked once to name a "good" thing that an enquirer might do it. We remember his reply:—

"Why askest thou Me concerning that which is good?"

The fact is, Jesus does not reach His values by the way of morality at all. He set out to establish neither a code nor a cult. His method is much more personal and searching.

Augustine said that the sum of Christian teaching is, "Love God, and do as you like." He came much nearer to the truth than the author of "Be good."

"Jesus said to His Jews: The law was for servants; love God as I love Him, as His Son! What have we Sons of God to do with morals." ■

It is possible that Nietzsche imagines he is here quoting Jesus against Christianity, but it is not so. That we are not saved by "works," that a correct moral life, described picturesquely as the "filthy rags of our own righteousness," is of no avail, is just what may be heard in any conventicle. Salvation is a matter of personal relationship to God, even among those whose idea of the Christian life seems narrowest. Possibly Protestantism, Nietzsche's *bête noir*, had no representatives more generally considered to be the enemies of life than the Puritans. Yet it is the Puritan Bunyan who pictures Mr. Legality, of the village of Morality, as one of those inefficient busy-bodies who fail to put the pilgrim on to the way of life.

Neither does Jesus appeal to our sense of duty as the final guide for us. Men have done evil things that their nature revolted at from a sense of "duty."

In the one picture of the final judgment which Jesus draws for us, those who are condemned were possibly moral enough, as morality is generally conceived. They sound sufficiently apologetic. And they claim that they have been ready to do their duty. But they had not discerned the Son of Man among the sons of men. Separatists, these, who

■ *Beyond Good and Evil*, 164.

thought that people who were lowly, unfortunate or "physiologically blotched" did not matter.

We find the key to the ethical teaching of Jesus in these words: "*That ye may be the sons of your Father.*" All that Jesus had to say about conduct springs from that. It springs, that is, from His conception of human Personality. As we have already seen, our true life is that of sons of God. He appeals therefore to those deep impulses within us which He recognises as carrying with them their own sanction. He bids us trust them as the voice of God in us and as the way of life.

Jesus, in His own words, did nothing but what He saw the Father do, and if He points out a way of life as having value for us, it is because He sees it to be the divine way of reaching the divine end. If He is right in that judgment, then His way is the only one which can ultimately succeed. He interpreted that way for all men to see, believing that when they saw it they would recognise it as answering to something in themselves. Men do recognise it, sometimes with longing, sometimes with fear, sometimes with hatred, sometimes with faith, and that is why, despite all the failures of the Church, and of those who have professed to follow Jesus, He still speaks to the consciousness of men to-day.

The Beatitudes, with which the fifth chapter of Matthew opens, contain the main characteristics of the man who is to make possible the Kingdom of God. It is important to note that they all belong to the same man. We must remember that throughout, since much criticism is based on the idea that, in the case of meekness, let us say, Jesus had in view some person of whom the only thing that can be said is that he is meek. That is not so at all. We shall consider these values separately, but our verdict must be given on the complete man.

The remainder of the Sermon on the Mount and other similar teaching may be said to represent the Man of the Beatitudes in action, as he faces the inevitable problems of daily life. Jesus says, in effect, I have shown you the new man, the son of the Father. Let me show you in these examples, how this God-like person will behave.

Necessarily examples cannot be unlimited. Necessarily men will have to face problems which are, in form at least, new. But after all, we need not be astonished to find that sons of the Father need to think for themselves.

Many of the examples and counsels which we find in these chapters have been put there by the compiler without regard to the circumstances under which they were given. In some cases we can find the event which produced the counsel in the other gospels, but in other cases we cannot, and as in dealing with human life practically every case is an exception in some way, we can see that to take the picturesque phrases and figures of Jesus as rigid rules, to be held to by the letter, may not be the best way to fulfil the mind of Jesus. We must interpret the words of Jesus by Jesus Himself, in whom we shall find them exemplified.

It should be clear also that to take the words of Jesus by the letter and to obey them as mere rules is not the way to act as a son of the Father. Men are not sons of God because they do such and such things. They do these things because they are sons of God, which is a different matter. The virtues of the Sermon on the Mount are virtues for the sons of God. Others try them at their peril. For while it is true that God is Father to all men, not all men are sons of the Father, though it is always open to them to become so. This is a paradoxical way of putting it, but the meaning, I think, is obvious. One

might put it in another way by saying that we cannot be sons of the Father on and off, when we chance to think of the matter, or in some activities of our life only, or when we are in a quandary and can see no other way out. The choice of this way must be the choice of the whole personality, freely made, and for life as a whole. It must be a conviction to which we do, to the best of our knowledge and power, absolutely commit ourselves. Jesus promises nothing whatever to anything less than that, but He gives out of His own experience an assurance of blessedness to those who do so consecrate themselves.

About blessedness a word must be said. Jesus does not set this state up as the end to be aimed at. He does not appeal to the desire for happiness. Blessedness is the accompanying state of those who, having chosen the Kingdom of God for their end, exhibit the characteristics which will make that end possible. They are blessed because they have chosen the right means to a good end,—because they will gain their end.

Yet it remains quite true to say that Christianity is a religion of blessedness, and that the Christian life is marked by an inward joy and peace which has often been the wonder of men. The New Testament is full of the spirit of joy as a present experience. The picture sometimes drawn for us of the Christian life as a meagre, narrow life of which the moving spirit is resentment, a kind of gloomy cellar in which men spend their time alternately bemoaning their own lot, envying the great whose power they affect to despise, and gloating over the joy that is to be theirs in the future when positions shall be reversed, is simply ludicrous in its falseness to the facts. It never has been true at any time, however much we may admit the fact that Christianity has often enough stood in danger of becoming lost in narrow

cliques and cults. It is the danger of all great movements, and few can outlive it. But the spirit of Jesus continually breaks forth afresh, renewing in men the old wonder and joy. The instances we have had in biography of morose fanatics forcing their rigidity and gloom upon a helpless family are much better illustrations of the evil effects of the Nietzschean lust for domination than of the spirit and temper of Christianity.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST STEP TO LIFE

"Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven."

WHO are the poor in spirit? The poor-spirited, or even the spiritually poor?

"Poor-spirited" we may rule out at once, as in entire contradiction to that appeal to heroism which Jesus continually makes. Those who hold that the Kingdom of God is entirely an inward experience are mostly agreed that this beatitude refers to those who are conscious of spiritual need. We remember, however, that the form of the beatitude which we find in Luke's gospel reads:—

"Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the Kingdom of God."

There has been some argument as to which really represents what Jesus said. It is suggested that Luke had a prejudice against the rich, shown in other places in his gospel as well as here, and that he, consciously or unconsciously, gave the words of Jesus a twist in the direction of his prejudice.

On the other hand it is said that Matthew may have toned down what sounded too revolutionary to suit the polite tastes of his readers. The writer of Matthew's gospel was a Jew, and his gospel is said to have a Hebrew or Aramaic foundation. He ought to have been able to give the correct meaning of Jesus. Luke was a Greek, and may have given a literal translation. So perhaps the exact words

that Jesus used were, "Blessed are the poor," and the thing He meant was, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." Or He may, at different times, have used both versions. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus never went over the ground more than once. The point of this is, that we must find an interpretation which covers both forms of the beatitude.

We must beware of the attempt that some people make to "spiritualise" the teaching of Jesus. "Spiritualise" is their own word. I do not pretend to know what they mean. Certainly I have no great desire to be more "spiritual" than Jesus was.

I remember calling on a preacher and finding him in concern because a sermon that he was expected to preach in two hours time was for some special occasion of which he had not been informed. Later on, I asked him how he managed. "Oh," he said, "I took an ordinary sermon and spiritualised it." I have often wondered what sort of a sermon it was, both before and after the process.

We get some light on what Jesus meant from a consideration of who the "poor" were. They were not the destitute. Palestine had not so far been favoured with such triumphs of industrial development that a "margin of unemployment," bounding a slough of destitution was one of its necessary conditions. Many were poor, in the sense that they had nothing for to-morrow, but there is no reason to think that any starved. Except in times of actual famine, people do not starve in the East. The poor generally were those who found just enough to support themselves and had no margin for luxuries and no time for idleness. Certain temple offerings were specially allowed to meet their case. The parents of Jesus made the temple offering of the "poor." So far as is discoverable there was no class which existed on "charities," save the lame, the diseased,

the blind, and such unfortunates. Jesus could not have had them in mind, for their state was one which He healed wherever possible.

Not only so, but "the poor" had come to have practically a technical meaning, and it is doubtless that meaning which is covered by the phrase, "poor in spirit." Poverty of any degree may be the result of laziness, of inefficiency, of vice, though it is quite as often the parent of these things. But it is neither those who are poor because they are faulty, nor those who are faulty because they are poor, to whom Jesus here refers.

In the Old Testament, the "poor" are the mass of common folk, the unprivileged, dispossessed by those of their day who wanted to realise what Nietzsche calls "the pathos of distance" (see Isa. v. 8), but maintaining in the midst of an arduous life a deep piety, and meeting the days as they come in a spirit of uncomplaining courage. We can find their modern equivalent at any time in the class of folk who endure hardships and face risks for small reward and less praise in the ordinary course of earning their bread. They meet life without gloves; they know it, not from books, but from daily contact with its realities. They can "go without" when it becomes necessary, and whatever shelter they desire against the unforeseen, the terrible and the tragic, they must with their own hands erect. Having no position to keep up in the eyes of men generally, they act from themselves, and their actions are genuine. If they count as "somebody," then it is by native character and personality. What they know has been wrought into their lives by face to face dealing with the actual demands of life.

William James tells us, in his *Talks to Students*, how he made this great discovery himself. He had escaped by train from an assembly at Chautauqua

Lake, and was reflecting on the something missing from that "middle-class paradise," which had so affected him that he felt the need of a dip into the primordial or the savage to set the balance right. He says:—

"And I soon recognised that it (the missing thing) was . . . the element of precipitousness, of strength and strenuousness, intensity and danger, . . . heroism, reduced to its bare chance, yet ever and anon snatching victory from the jaws of death. . . . An irremediable flatness is coming over the world. Bourgeoisie and mediocrity . . . are taking the place of the old heights and depths and romantic chiaroscuro."

This is the very complaint of Nietzsche. One of his great sayings is, "Live dangerously," and the hearts of all who feel the flatness of life and the dulness of modern stay-at-home conditions cannot but respond. But we need not be trapped into the melodrama of Nietzsche's remedy. William James goes on:

"With these thoughts in my mind, I was speeding with the train towards Buffalo, when, near that city, the sight of a workman doing something on the dizzy edge of a sky-scaling iron construction brought me to my senses very suddenly . . . I had been steeping myself in pure ancestral blindness . . . Wishing for heroism and the spectacle of human nature on the rack, I had never noticed the great fields of heroism lying round about me. There, every day of the year somewhere, is human nature *in extremis* for you . . . Divinity lies all about us, and culture is too hidebound even to suspect the fact."*

It is there, in the common lives of undistinguished people that reality can be found to all who care to

* W. James : *Talks on Psychology*, 274 f.

look, a daily struggle with untoward conditions, rising at the point of demand to the loftiest heroism. They do not talk about life, they live.

Farthest removed from them in spirit are those who, surrounded by many artificial aids to life, have lost touch with life itself, and judge it by the unreal standards to which they have become habituated. They may be morally blameless, but their virtue has been the line of least resistance, or it is merely "good form" and does not spring from a free spirit. They are the people who never learn anything because it never occurs to them that they, being who they are, could be anything other than finally right. The spirit of unteachable self-complacency which is impervious to ideas is not peculiar to any one class, but the comfortably placed are certainly most liable to it. "You will hear everlastingly . . . this argument, that the rich man cannot be bribed. The fact is, of course, that the rich man is bribed; he has been bribed already. That is why he is a rich man. The whole case for Christianity is that a man who is dependent upon the luxuries of life is a corrupt man, spiritually corrupt, politically corrupt, financially corrupt."* Riches do not shut any man out of the Kingdom of God, but they certainly make it hard to enter, because men are so ready to consider the power they owe to money, to birth, to office or other accidental circumstances, as virtues belonging to their personality, and as they are often in a position to slip through life without ever facing its crudities or taking their share of its burdens, they tend to be peculiarly self-satisfied and unteachable. They tend to the style of the Laodiceans, who said, "I am rich and increased with goods and have need of nothing, and knew not that they that were wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked."

* G. K. Chesterton : *Orthodoxy*, 217.

Their tragedy is that scarcely anything costs *them* anything; it only costs money. Take the artificial away from them, and they are like a deaf man who has lost his ear trumpet.

“Does a rich man know what life is? Does he keep himself in touch with the raw realities of life? Can he understand, does he even see people and things as they are? . . . A rich man cannot be a great artist. Even if he succeeds his art must be a hothouse fruit. The great Goethe struggled in vain; parts of his soul were atrophied, he lacked certain of the vital organs, which were killed by his wealth.”*

Blessed are the poor. But it is not poverty that itself is blessed. Blessed are the poor in spirit, because they have the disposition which is the first step toward the Kingdom of God. They are in touch with realities and are open to learn.

The same idea is illustrated in the story of the rich young ruler. He was bidden, if he would be perfect—in life, for that was his desire,—to sell all he had and give to the poor, and—“follow Me!” It was not a question of getting rid of his riches because it was wrong to be rich, or he would surely have been advised to throw his money away, and not to imperil the souls of other people by handing it on to them. He was to become poor, and follow Jesus, because he would then have to forsake the sheltered life of easy goodness that he had known. His life had been correct enough, but he himself had found it unsatisfactory. Let him come to life at first hand, and find it, not a seat in a cushioned carriage, but an adventure.

Jesus had chosen to deal with life at first hand, to “live dangerously,” but not melodramatically. He was no limelight hero demanding the stage to Himself, nor was He in need of the “pathos of

* Romain Rolland: *John Christopher*.

distance" that He might stand out in better relief. He approved and chose the way of the poor, because He saw that this way of stark courage, with neither drums nor decorations, is the way of God, and so the way of life.

The way of God! But in what sense can we say that God is poor in spirit? In this, that He is finally the Master of Reality. The God whom Jesus called Father is not some far off idle Potentate, but a working God, present in all the dust and struggle of the world order. As William James has said, God is not a gentleman, though the Prince of Darkness may be such. God, whatever we may conceive Him to be in Himself, is only *revealed* to us under the limitations of creative life, and in human personalities, of whom Jesus is chief and master. Our own freedom is a limitation to God, even though it be self imposed.

If the story science tells us is at all to be trusted, God has made endless experiments, ever expressing Himself more and more fully in varying forms of life, until physical evolution ends in the birth of human personality.

"Art Thou not all that is?"

"I am not all that is. I am Life fighting nothingness . . . I am the Fire which burns in the night . . . I am the eternal Light; I am not an eternal destiny soaring above the fight. I am free will which struggles eternally. Struggle and burn with me."*

All life is an adventure, and God is the Great Adventurer. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," is the word of Jesus. And still He works through those who possess this spirit which Jesus exhibits and commends. There is no way to Personality save by the door of Reality.

* *John Christopher*, Book iv., 159 f.

CHAPTER III

DIVINE DISCONTENT

"Blessed are they that mourn : for they shall be comforted."

Most things can be overdone, and even virtue has its special temptations. It is not always easy to say just where economy becomes meanness, where prudence changes to cowardice, or courage to foolhardiness, where kindness runs to seed in weakness. And the way to prevent such calamity is not to aim at being "moderate" in all things, moderately economical, moderately brave, moderately kind, but to balance economy with generosity, courage with wisdom, kindness with firmness. That is the Christian way.

The characteristic described by Jesus in His first beatitude has this special danger, that those who deal with life at first hand and are ready to learn from every experience, who take the rough with the smooth, are apt to lapse into an easy-going fatalism. It may be of the cheerful sort which sees the humour of it all :—" Ah, well, we've got to take the world as we find it. The sun will shine to-morrow, likely enough." It may be the pathetically helpless, which sings, " Meekly wait and murmur not." It may be the cynical—" Um ! This is Life, this is ! " In any case it *acquiesces*, and *without joy*, or any sense of an end which makes the experience worth while. It is much too ready to " accept the inevitable."

The message of the second beatitude is that we are not to be so easily satisfied, either with ourselves or

with things in general. If self-complacency is the fault the first beatitude by implication hits at, then complacency with the evil order of things is the fault aimed at here. Our willingness to learn from any experience and to face realities is not to become a readiness to accept any experience as inevitable and unalterable. We can learn from evil things, but we are not to accept evil as of the final nature of things.

Our man of the beatitudes has seen a vision of life in the Kingdom of God. The bandage has been taken from his eyes. He will set about realising the Divine life in this world, ready to learn from every experience that offers. He finds evil things on every hand, some of which he suffers from and meets with what courage he can compass, others which he sees falling hardly on those about him. In his towns he finds the most horrible ugliness and squalour. He is given to understand, should he make any comment on these things, that they are prevalent in all towns, apparently are a necessary part of town or city life. "But," he is assured for his comfort, "where there's dirt, there's money." Which is true enough. In his streets he finds destitution and misery. He is reminded that even Jesus said that the poor would always be with us. He meets, as he goes about, the maimed and disfigured and diseased bodies of his fellows. Round the corner is the asylum and the hospital for "incurables." The heavy squat building on the outskirts of the town is the gaol.

His morning paper gives him to understand that a strike is in progress, despite the war clouds that hang so heavily over the land. The war columns tell him with something like triumph that our new big guns have worked incredible and unprintable havoc upon thousands of the enemy. There are stories of sickening atrocities. In an obscure corner there is recorded the fact that the condemned man walked firmly to

the gallows, and that a severe sentence was passed on the parent who had cruelly tortured a little child. The editor perhaps has a leader on the remarkable progress of civilisation.

At his work our man makes acquaintance with the coarseness, stupidity, insolence, perversity, triviality and general awkwardness of some of those in company with whom he earns his living.

In the evening he picks up a book of history or travel and learns something of man's inhumanity to man. In the middle of his reading a friend drops in with news about that bit of jobbery in the Town Council

"It's disgusting!" he says.

They talk on for a while, and our man pictures the town as it might be, if things were done a little differently. He gets quite eloquent as he warms up, and before he knows what he is at, has reorganised the world, "a little nearer to our heart's desire." The friend laughs good naturedly. . . .

"Ah, my boy, you're one of these quixotic idealists, that's your trouble. All you succeed in doing is to make yourself miserable. *I* say, don't notice these things. Be above them, if you can, but anyhow, take no notice. You can't alter them. If there's a God, they're His will—disease and so forth, any way,—I suppose wickedness won't be. It's no use worrying. You cannot alter human nature."

Is our man to accept that as the last word on the matter?

And perhaps, when he ought to be turning in, his thoughts come round to this: I have been blaming all these people, but what about myself. They hang on to evil because they think there is some security for themselves in it, because they are afraid to let themselves go in frank and open dealing. Have I dared to trust the impulse to fellowship and truth

and right at all costs, which is all that is needed to alter the face of the earth ?

He is not the happiest man in the world when he turns off the gas on his way to bed.

Yet Jesus says, "Blessed are they that mourn." He would not mourn if he had not seen something better. There is something hopeful about it after all. The good artist is dissatisfied with every picture he ever painted. He has never got all his vision expressed yet. You may consider him foolish, if he has done his best, but you will admit that he is more likely to paint the really great picture than the man who made a hit by painting a poodle in his early days, and has gone on painting poodles ever since.

The good engineer, the engineer on the way of life so far as engineering is concerned, is the man who is dissatisfied with every engine he has ever seen. He is the man who will invent a better.

"Verily, neither do I like those who call everything good, and this world the best of all. Those do I call the all-satisfied.

"All-satisfiedness, which knoweth how to taste everything, that is not the best taste."*

There is a divine discontent, as well as the one which is grumpy, sour and impotent, literally a *divine* discontent.

For what right have we to be discontented ? Where do we get these ideas of a perfect order, of a free and full and satisfying life ? Where do they come from, these "thoughts that burn like irons when we think ?" We know that it is the deepest in us that speaks at these times. Nay more, we know that if men universally gave rein to that instinct, the world would be a better place.

It is the way of hope, after all. The man who mourns at the presence of evil may fail to remove it,

* Nietzsche: *Thus spake Zarathustra*.

in spite of his best endeavours, but the man who accepts it as inevitable will never try. The Creative Will cannot use him. He represents inertia, the dead weight which is hardest to lift. He stands in the way of every good thing, bland, stupid, immovable, perhaps the most exasperating person in the world.

The most alive personality is the most sensitive, but it is not always comforting to be sensitive. The ear that is readiest to approve the perfect harmony suffers most from the discord.

Blessed are they that mourn, to whom, as to Jesus, evil is a grief and a degradation, because so far removed from God's final purpose for man. A pig in a ditch does not move us, but a man in the ditch does, for he is not in his proper place.

Jesus believed that the Father was ever working to enlarge life, to set it free from limitations; that were men ready to join hands in the enterprise, the things that thwart and cripple life might be overcome. Evil is not to be acquiesced in, nor even to be argued about, but to be overcome. Of the man blind from birth the disciples asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents?" The answer is, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents. But that the works of God should be made manifest in him, we must work the works of Him that sent me," that is, cure him.*

To be sensitive is not always comfortable, but the sensitive to evil are also sensitive to good. The mourners shall be comforted, for they will ever be the first to catch the hint of good, the promise of better things. It is they through whom God can work, who will not accept the evils of the world as inevitable, who will not shrink from bearing the burden of them, who will acquiesce in nothing that is alien to what they have seen of God. Because they seek to evade nothing, their spirits may often be filled with anguish,

* John ix. 2-4. Reading suggested by Dr. Campbell Morgan.

but never will they be more truly sons of the Father than at that point. It is then that they are "met from the eyes and brow of Him who was indeed acquainted with grief, by a look of solemn recognition, such as may pass between friends who have endured between them some strange and secret sorrow, and are through it united in a bond that cannot be broken."*

Out of their efforts and pains the Kingdom of God will come.

■ Dora Greenwell.

CHAPTER IV

THE WAY THAT SUCCEEDS

"Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth."

It sounds incredible enough. We think of Mark Twain's ironical remark as to this being the place in the Bible where the English are referred to. We have lived, however, to see it dealt with much more seriously, as witness:—

"This prophecy has almost literally come true: for the weak (*sic*) have not done at all badly in this regard. They have certainly inherited many parts of England, if we may judge from the death-like stillness that surrounds everything on a Sunday . . . the sanctimonious faces . . . the mournful gait . . . Everything that elevates life, that stimulates life, is carefully kept out of sight. The shadow of death hangs over all."*

This will serve as showing what the Christian values have come to mean for some people. It may be true that Christian people have only themselves to thank that it is so, but it is certainly not the fault of the teaching of Jesus. If we have been right in our interpretation of what was the final test of value to Him, then meekness is some quality which belongs to God, and its survival value is in its strength, its power to add to life.

Perhaps we may have misunderstood it. Perhaps we have dragged down a good word to the level of our

* J. M. Kennedy: *Nietzsche*, p. 52.

timidity and made a virtue of our cowardice. What is the current Christian notion of the meek man? What is the usual fate of the type that answers to our notion?

Lest I should be guilty of parody, I have looked up some correspondence in a religious paper on this very point,

The question was, "If there is a meek man in your office, what will happen to him?" There were many answers, which may be roughly summarised as follows:—

1. The meek man will be put upon, and will be despised for so allowing his good nature to be taken advantage of. In the end he will probably be dismissed for inefficiency.

2. The meek man will suffer, but will finally win.

3. The meek man will suffer, but must simply bear it all with resignation.

The one thing about which there seems to be general agreement is the idea of what "meekness" means. There was no definition given, but all assume that meekness is a passive virtue. No self-assertion and barely self-respect. And that seems to be the generally accepted idea of meekness. The meek man will suffer all things in the spirit of the martyr, perhaps with what is known as "the air of a martyr," than which nothing much more provocative exists. He will not protest, he will only look mournful and injured. When he confides his troubles to another meek brother, he will receive, maybe, the assurance that he will have his reward in heaven.

"But the meek are to inherit the earth."

"Ah, true! Others may have the deeds and own the land. But none can rob you of the landscape."

There may be occasions when that statement is true, but to offer it seriously as an explanation of the promise of Jesus will not do. It makes one feel a

keen sympathy for the man who, on being exhorted to look for a crown above, asked for half a crown now, to be going on with.

I feel that I can understand a little of Nietzsche's scorn. Perhaps he was nourished in his youth on spiritual food of that sort.

I have seen a man at a country fair put a sovereign into a threepenny purse and then offer it to the crowd for a shilling. I have seen a country youth hand up his shilling and receive his purse. And I remember his face when he opened it and looked for the sovereign. What I have seen of Jesus makes me quite sure that He made no illusory offers of that sort. When He said that the meek shall inherit the earth, it was because He believed that they will. Nor do I find in Jesus either an example or a teacher of merely passive virtues. Nor do I believe that the virtues of God are passive virtues.

What did Jesus mean by this beatitude ?

Jesus quotes almost word for word from a verse in the thirty-seventh Psalm. In that Psalm we find that meekness is set in contrast not so much to the insolence and aggressiveness of the powerful, as to the spirit of fretfulness and angry impatience which is perhaps natural to the man who is confronted with evil, in the shape of a successful and flourishing evil doer. Meekness is opposed, that is, to the spirit of resentment which does not really lessen the sum of evil, but adds to it.

"Fret not thyself, it tendeth only to evil doing."

We have moreover in the Old Testament a story that would be quite familiar to Jesus, the story of the man who was by the Jews regarded as pre-eminently the type of meekness. We shall have to find room for Moses in our idea of meekness. Not many would venture to call him weak who welded the Jews into a nation. The story of his leadership

is the story of persistent patience, with odd lapses which emphasise our idea, for we are given to understand that they were the points at which he failed. He refused to be discouraged, he refused to let his purpose be overcome, though his followers were never so stupid and obstinate. He shepherded them, gave them laws, instructed their ignorance. He took hold of a group of spiritless slaves and made them a free people. Yet, "the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon earth."

Meekness, in the case of Moses, was the patience which would not stop short of its purpose.

We can now see what Jesus means. Meekness balances the "mourning" of the second beatitude as that balances the first. The temptation of the man who is sensitive to evil is to grow violent about it, to rage and storm, to clamour for repressive laws. "Righteous indignation," of course. . . . In extreme cases he becomes the Nihilist, and renouncing society and all its ways, sets himself to destruction.

The good is not to be won that way. Evil is not overcome nor the cause of life furthered nor greatness shown by our becoming bitter or violent, but by persistent and assiduous well-doing. When you have lost your temper you have betrayed your cause.

You remember the wet summer evening when you undertook some little and overdue repair in the house. It seemed quite a small matter and not worth bringing in a man for, but it turned out to be one of those perverse little jobs that need three hands and the power to see on both sides of a thing at once. You kept on patiently and at each failure started again. Then suddenly, your patience snapped and you hurled the offending thing across the floor. . . .

You will remember that you had to buy a new one and felt rather small over it. It was a failure in meekness.

In John Masefield's *Dauber*, when the crowd of shipmates gather round to mock at what they judge to be his crude painting their victim replies :—

You cannot understand that. Let it be.
 You cannot understand, nor know, nor share.
 This is a matter touching only me ;
 My sketch may be a daub, for all I care.
 You may be right. But even if you were,
 Your mocking should not stop this work of mine ;
 Rot though it be, its prompting is divine.

Had Dauber been meek in some merely passive sense he would have given up as a bad job the painting which offended his mates. But he held on. The same spirit made a man of him and won their respect when he had to take his turn aloft in the gale.

That is meekness : *active patience in the face of untoward conditions*. The spirit that keeps its temper—and keeps going on. It is not the virtue of the weak, nor does it belong to cowards, for it never gives in and never knows when it is beaten. It is a man's virtue, nay a God's. If there is one characteristic of the Creative Will that no one can possibly deny, it is infinite patience. It will not be suppressed. It is a virtue of Life itself.

But, it may be said, anyone will agree that to lose patience with inanimate things is foolish. It is a different matter when the evil is violent and personal. The inanimate thing does not strike you back or plot deliberately against your well-being. There is no malice in it. Suppose it is another man who is the difficulty, a man malicious and evil in spirit, who deliberately does you an evil. Shall patience deny justice? Are there no human rights it is a duty to defend, no point at which resentment is a duty? This question will be more fully answered later, but meanwhile let it be said that nothing could be further from the truth than to suppose that in these cases the

proper attitude of the Christian is one of passivity, or that the Christian has no power to stop evil, or that he must be content with evil conditions which can be removed. We have already seen that. We shall find, however, in all cases, that the rule of patience holds good.

Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Jesus adds to the Old Testament promise the idea of the Kingdom of God, which is to come on earth, a spiritual order in which all evil shall be overcome. In a sense in which Mr. Kennedy and those who agree with him do not seem to realise, the meek are coming into their inheritance. The scientist patiently investigating, refusing to give up his belief in the ultimate intelligibility of things; the seeker after new powers, patiently continuing his experiments in the face of repeated failures; the inventor, making trial after trial, scrapping disappointment after disappointment, yet starting again; these are all in their several spheres examples of meekness, and they are inheriting the earth. They are enlarging the possibilities of human life and pushing back its limitations. And though they sometimes refuse to serve God as sons, yet as servants they do His will and hasten the day of His kingdom. Whether servants or sons, their meekness springs from a great faith, from the conviction that they who ask shall have, they who seek shall find, and to them that knock the door shall be opened.

It is precisely so in the sphere of conduct and of human relationships, from the smallest to the largest. The world is made for the fullest life for all men, for conscious sonship, for Personality. Whatever hinders that is evil, and being evil, can be overcome. But only by the way of patience. We may fail and fail again. Men may refuse to respond. The arguments so convincing to us leave them unmoved. Evil may

mock at us as we view mournfully the ruins of our endeavour. We may be tempted to lash out in violence and bitterness, to cry out hysterically for repressions and floggings and vengeance on wrongdoers. And perhaps our own self esteem is hurt. We cannot easily bear to fail. Let us fling the whole thing up. Why waste time over such stupid and ungrateful folk!

It will be better to remember two things. One, that violence and bitterness never succeeded yet—not finally.

The other, that wise saying of Mazzini, who had abundant opportunities for judging: "Discouragement is disenchanted egoism."

We will build again, and build better.

CHAPTER V

mt 56

THE PASSION FOR RIGHTNESS

"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after Righteousness, for they shall be filled."

"THEN," one can imagine a critical hearer saying to himself, "after all this large air and fine talk, this 'stuffing so much into the heads of paltry people,' this wringing of the hands over evil, the practical conclusion is that you must be patient and take what you can get! You go out with a brass band and all the flags flying, and before the triumphant strain has died away you have dropped down into an ordinary compromise maker, who veils his shabby little efforts for advantage with idealist clap-trap. We know the breed. They promise men great things at political elections and such like. 'The millenium is on the way. Only elect *me*, and the day will have arrived.' When, later on, we enquire if some solid gain is not about due, they smile wisely and knowingly, as pitying the ignorance of those who cannot be expected to see what great things they are accomplishing, and tell us to be patient. And when at last, perhaps, come the mountain throes of parturition, behold—a mouse! Be patient. That means, keep on compromising!"

Let us admit that this, if somewhat, though no more exaggerated than what one often reads in similar strain, is the danger of the meek, and that, yielded to, it has been the ruin of many a good man. Meekness becomes weakness. Patience becomes that slackness which passes for tolerance.

It happens that a traditional saying of Jesus gives us His opinion of that kind of tolerance, as well as showing us by implication the vitality of the virtue He demanded.

“Beholding one working on the Sabbath, he saith unto him: Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou: but if thou knowest not, accursed art thou, and a transgressor of the law.”

Jesus was no timid rule keeper, but equally He was no compromiser, and we may be sure that if a value He recommends to us lays us open to the danger, He has not forgotten to add the corrective. In meekness, Jesus has given us a tool to work with. Now He hands us the whetstone.

“Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness.”

Hunger and thirst, as experiences, we probably only know the beginnings of. A sailor friend has told me of thirst-maddened seamen throwing themselves overboard, and of those who reached land plunging into a pool of fresh water and wallowing in it. Thirst means to him what it can never mean to me. I have been hungry and beyond the reach of food, but once I saw a decently dressed man snatch out of the mud of a city street a broken biscuit, which a child had flung down, and rush up a side street to devour it. I must conclude that I have never known hunger.

Jesus chooses the strongest words He can find. Hunger and thirst are not demands that can be put away and forgotten. They are primary and elemental things, quite equal to keeping themselves before our notice. We may be patient, but if patience becomes complaisance, we are not really hungry.

The object of this intense desire is Righteousness.

This is one of the great words of the Bible, and that it stands for something big and positive is clear on the face of it. That, no doubt, is why those who attack

the beatitudes stop short when they reach this one. No unprejudiced person could describe it as "negative morality," or as "slave morality." So far as it represents morality at all, we might call it, with Mr. Parton Milum, "brother morality,"* but it really lifts the matter into another sphere altogether.

"The Greek word popularly rendered 'righteousness,' but having from its root a much wider significance, includes the purely ethical idea of upright behaviour in the more extensive conception of balance, wholeness, the perfect equilibrium of a nature no longer out of relation with any element in the universe."†

There is an inward demand that we all make on life, a demand for harmony, proportion, balance, fitness, completeness. The sense of beauty springs out of that demand, the sense of truth, the sense of righteousness.

I found an artist friend in difficulties over a picture. He knew what he wanted and possessed the requisite technical skill, but his work did not satisfy him and he could not get on with it. What he said was that it was not "right." I saw it again a week later. My first words were,

"You have done something to this picture. It looks different."

"Yes," he said. "I got it right."

It was some question of balance. He had neither added nor taken away anything, strictly speaking, but a tree in the middle distance had been moved an inch or so and its tone deepened. The change had turned the representation of a landscape into a picture which satisfied. In my friend's own slang, it was something more like "it." But "it" was not the landscape, but something in himself, and, as I recognised, in me also.

* *Revolutionary Christianity.*

† Woods: *The Gospel of Rightness.*

Truth, goodness and beauty are the famous trinity of which philosophers have discussed the meaning for centuries. I do not propose to add to the sea of words, but merely to point out that they have all one thing in common. We may not be able to define the terms so as to satisfy anyone but ourselves, and perhaps not even that, but when we recognise that a thing is true or good or beautiful, we mean that it satisfies that inner demand of ours for balance, fitness, harmony—for "rightness." The thing is right, in its own sphere; it satisfies our taste, our conscience, our moral sense, we may say. Ultimately it is our Personality that is satisfied. That tastes differ, and that people are not all agreed as to what is right and wrong does not affect the question, for there are personalities in all stages of development. What satisfies the sense of rightness of the most perfect personality will be finally right, and will be the most expressive of and most helpful to life.

And if we push back beyond all the scattered and imperfect personalities of men to that ground of all our personalities, the tree on which as leaves we grow, the complete Personality, which is God, we must think of that quality in its fulness as being the expression of His life also.

We have the right so to push back, since it seems clear that this threefold ideal is not of our making. We but respond to something which is already there. It may come to us as a mere hint, awaking our desire, but as we follow it in any or all of its directions it widens out before us and becomes infinite. There is nothing to stop us; we have only to go on to find God.

Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness,—that is, rightness in the sphere of action.

Righteousness cannot be reached by rules, any more than truth or beauty can be created by them. They

are all expressions of Personality. Yet, to continue our illustration, there are principles of composition, to violate which is to defeat the artist's own end. Furthermore, righteousness, like truth and beauty, is an abstraction. The words stand for qualities which we find in persons, actions, ideas, things. How to transfer what we see into some concrete form which it will illuminate is a question of method. The Sermon on the Mount is a manual of principles and illustrations of method. But the first demand, without which principles and methods can only produce a mechanical imitation of the real thing, is the sense of rightness, and the passion to express it. "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

Jesus believed that the sense of rightness was already present in the hearts of men, no more an alien or a stranger than the sense of truth or the sense of beauty. If we cannot define, we recognise them, and as in the sphere of æsthetics the hunger of a man for beauty and his efforts to express what he has seen of it develop his personality and enrich his life; and as his success in such expression is the measure of the richness of his personality, so in the sphere of action. Jesus urged men to trust that inner conviction, to follow it in the face of anything that would impose on them from without. For it is the very voice of God.

The dreams of the Hebrew prophets were the creation of their sense of rightness. All they realise of beauty and truth and righteousness glows in their words. Jesus, greater than them all, aware of His relationship to God and to His fellows which was not found by report but in experience, was able to gather up and interpret all their hints, and prove the reality of His insight in the expression of His own personality. Here He tells us how we may follow His example.

In its form this beatitude differs from the rest. Why did not Jesus say, "Blessed are the righteous?" Partly, no doubt because perfect righteousness can only be expressed by God, to whom we are to aspire. But there is another reason, which it is important we should notice, for it concerns the nature of righteousness.

It will be clear by this time, that righteousness can no more be a private thing than beauty can. There can be no special rightness which is the preserve of a few, and from which others must be warned off. If I can see more deeply than others into the nature of things and confront men with a daring achievement or a new interpretation, or even with what has been called "a new size of man," it is good indeed, and I must hold to my vision at all costs. But if the new thing is not finally true and possible and vital for all men, it does not count, any more than the appearance of a three-legged man would count. If the Superman cannot take us all with him, he is no superman, but merely a freak. There can be no "master morality" and "slave morality" maintained as separate things finally suitable to different orders of men, for one or the other would be a defiance of the nature of things and so doomed to perish. The "transvaluation of all values," in the direction of a special morality for great men is much what the transvaluation of the principles of composition for select artists would be. The results would be startling enough, as freak pictures sometimes are. They are not as a rule painted by masters, but by those who mistake crudity and violence for strength and eccentricity for genius.

There is another side to this, for Jesus has not finished His picture, and we shall have to look at the possible fate of the pioneer. No further consideration, however, can invalidate the fact that I can only fully satisfy my demand for "rightness," which is part of

my demand for Personality, as I seek it in every possible human relationship.

Righteousness is a social value: it is part of the Kingdom of God. If I am ever to "come out and be separate," it is not that I may be alone above men with a special kind of virtue to be exercised for my own advantage. That has no more value—even for me—than the invention of a language for my own private use. It is only that I may be unencumbered by compromise and complaisance with evil. I am to keep the edge of my sword sharp.

The Pharisees were separatists of the exclusive sort. "This people who knoweth not the law is accursed." They despised the herd. But it is a fact and not a fancy that their way was not the way of life. They had meant well in the beginning:—the purification of their nation. They were the select few who would improve the type Jew, as Nietzsche's master moralists are to improve the type Man. They ended as such separatist attempts always do, in a *cul-de-sac*. The aristocrat is officialised. He becomes a dog in the manger, not only failing in life himself, but blocking the way for others. Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the separatists ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

When we seek righteousness together, says Jesus, we shall get it: but this promise, like all others, looks forward for its perfect fulfilment, though it is realisable now. The final righteousness to which we look, with which we shall be filled, is that of the life of the perfect Kingdom, when God and man are finally at one, and righteousness, along with all other forms of rightness, will be the spontaneous and joyful expression of complete Personality.

CHAPTER VI

CONSIDERATENESS

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

A WELL-KNOWN Bible Dictionary informs us that Christianity chiefly emphasises and values the "milder virtues." I have found that one has to be careful about the meaning of words in these matters, or it leads to misunderstanding. What is a mild virtue? When a friend offers me a cigar and assures me benignly that it is quite mild, he wishes me to understand that its flavour is not strong enough to affect me at all disagreeably. He may be only anxious to propitiate my delicate taste in cigars, but his assurance of mildness sounds more like a good-natured desire to spare my weak head. Are the Christian virtues mild in that sense, and is the Christian to be, like the dog which barks furiously when you are at the gate and licks your hand as you ring the bell at the door, hungry for righteousness, and then merciful? One of the mediæval saints, a woman, too, kissed the face of a decapitated criminal whom in mercy she had attended to his death. Could that be styled the working of a mild virtue?

Let us draw one distinction to clear the ground. Pity and mercy are often confused, but they are not quite the same. Pity is an emotion called out by a state of weakness, suffering or helplessness in another. It carries with it the idea that the one who pities is in a more favoured position than the object of his pity. Nietzsche tells us that pity is "the virtue of the weak

and botched," meaning, I take it, the virtue they admire. As a matter of fact they more often deeply resent pity. It would be more correct to call pity the virtue of the favoured, who tend to regard the wretchedness of others as something to sharpen their feeling of superiority on.

The Christian attitude towards weakness and suffering is described not as pity, but as compassion. That also is an emotion, but the compassionate, as the word suggests, "suffer with" the sufferer. Even the favoured do not pity their friends, they sympathise with them. Sympathy is very nearly compassion. The pity of the patronising is a luxury, but compassion is a pain. Jesus was *moved* with compassion, and always moved to help. If it be said that compassion, suffering with the sufferer, is a virtue which uses up the strength, one can only reply that that is what strength is for, to be used. Compassion is the fellow feeling of the strong and the desire to express that feeling in helpfulness. Its opposite is callousness, which means lack of imagination, and is a sign of poverty of Personality.

Mercy springs from the will, and is the fruit of a decision arrived at on consideration of some defect in another's character and achievement which might seem to deserve censure or even punishment. For reasons which satisfy, it makes allowances and stays or limits censure or punishment.

As Jesus uses the word, the meaning seems to be that of considerateness, kindness, which presses no advantage, and is ready to stop short of pressing a claim to the full.

Mercy is often opposed to justice, and if the justice in view is the necessarily cold and mechanical type which obtains in a court of law, we can understand the opposition. But that is not the kind of justice that Jesus dealt in. Nietzsche puts it well: "Justice is

love—with seeing eyes.” Justice is, in the end, the same as righteousness, which we have seen must in its perfection belong only to God. Equally so must perfect mercy be looked for there, for Jesus is still drawing the perfect man with God as the model. “Be ye merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful.”

Now we cannot think that two such qualities as righteousness and mercy can exist in the same personality in their perfection if they are really opposed to one another. If they are exercised alternately, then one is in abeyance, and if they annul one another, then neither has any meaning for us. We read of “justice tempered with mercy.” As a phrase applicable to law courts, we understand what is meant, but even then it means something less than justice.

Perhaps mercy is not applicable to God at all, but is merely the virtue of the coward who runs up an account and snivels when the bill comes in! We are told that nature is sternly just, and knows no mercy, that to break the laws of nature entails evil results which are certain and cannot be escaped. Let us take the kind of illustration usually chosen by those who argue so. The drunkard has broken nature’s laws. He reaps from what he sows, and the unhealthy face, jumpy nerves and poisoned blood are the reward. He has reaped the reward of evil, men say. But there is surely some confusion here. What is the evil of drunkenness? Is it not just that it produces evil results? If it did not, there would be nothing evil about it. The act of drinking is in itself innocent enough. The results are the evil. The drunkard has simply called upon nature to ruin his body. He has not broken the laws of nature: he has experienced their working.

Well, then, let us say that he broke the laws of health, and so met the reward of disease. We must not be misled by the sub-conscious moral implication

we read into "laws of health." The plain truth is that the man chose to take things which are uniformly found to be detrimental to the health of the body. He found that he was no exception. He was foolish to think so, and his folly has returned on his head. There is no escape. Nature lets nobody off. In that sense we might say that nature knows no mercy, but that is only another way of saying that certain effects follow certain causes. And that is as merciful as it is just, neither more nor less. Certainly we could not live in a world where it was otherwise. Nature is not vindictive. The man who drinks too much gets plain hints that he is injuring his body. The moment he takes the hint and ceases the course which led to evils, the work of healing and restoration sets in. That is justice as much as it is mercy, neither more nor less.

Both the pain that follows the one course and the healing that follows the other suggest that some powerful force in nature is making for life, will hurt us if we attempt to thwart it, and will be behind us if we obey it.

And there is a real sense in which nature makes allowances. Man has become what he is from being an extremely ignorant and limited creature. He has had everything to find out, and that has made a man of him. But at every stage he has found a world he could use and take part in. His imperfect knowledge has never crushed him out of existence.

The whole truth, however, is that in the natural order all talk of justice and mercy is a little absurd. They are personal terms and can only be understood in relation to Personality. We may speak of them in relation to God and man and not properly anywhere else. The whole story of man's religious experience is the story of God's righteousness and mercy, working not in opposition or alternation, but for the same end. At all stages of his religious experience we find man

reaching after God, and sharing in the purpose of God, the bringing of many sons to a more complete knowledge of Himself and themselves. Men blunder and fail, and when they follow something less than the best they know, or turn back again to the ways of the beast, the inevitable result follows. This is no theory, it is the plain story of history. But the moment they repent, that is, see their error and strive to amend it, healing and renewal follow. For God is not vindictive. Justice to Him does not mean that someone must be made to smart. It means the triumph of the divine way, which is the way of life for all. Any man is sufficiently punished when he finds he is wrong and really turns to the right. If punishment shows a man that he is wrong, it is mercy as much as righteousness. If he finds that he is wrong and turns to the right, then to stay punishment and grant forgiveness—that is the putting away of the sense of wrong—and a renewal of life is justice as well as mercy. And so it is written, "He is faithful and *just* to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

That then was how Jesus thought of God, and such was His own practice. He never condoned evil, but He never flung back on his sins the man who repented of evil. In His story of the prodigal, the hunger in the far country was justice, but also mercy, for it brought him to himself. His reception at home was mercy, but it was also justice, for it meant that righteousness had triumphed.

But Jesus went farther than that in His thought of God. His was the daring belief that God suffered with the sinner and for the sinner, that the righteousness and mercy of the Father were but two sides of a deep and awful love which has set itself to win men at all costs, which will not abate by one jot the tremendous purpose in which all our greatest good is contained,

but will strive and struggle and suffer in us and with us and for us till the great end be obtained. It was His vision of the Father that made at once the agony and triumph of His cross, where no one can say whether the hunger for righteousness or the passion of mercy is more supreme.

Having seen so much, the way of the man of the Beatitudes will be plain. He is to hunger and thirst after righteousness. He may, in his inadequate conception of righteousness, be tempted to be harsh in his judgment of others, inconsiderate in his demands, severe in his condemnation of those who not only do not come up to his standard, but who do not yet perceive it. He will be apt to refuse to make any allowances for those less favourably situated than himself. He will be tempted so to do and be, if he does not remember that what he stands for is so much bigger than his own personal idea that in the light of perfect righteousness his own achievements will not be noticeably greater than those of men he is inclined to judge hardly. We cannot afford to be harsh judges of one another. That is the simple truth. We all need mercy as well as justice.

The man who follows Jesus will learn to put himself in the place of others, and by a great understanding to feel with them, to share in their hopes and joys as well as to bear something of their burdens. He will find himself made strangely conscious of the presence of God in so doing. It is not a great personality that flees from the sorrows of others or disdains their limitations, nor is it on the way to become such.

This is but another instance in which Jesus appeals to a deep instinct in ordinary and unsophisticated men. There are virtues which may be counted arguable, but kindness speaks for itself. The search after God has led men into strange fields. Men have scaled the heights and dared the depths, and have brought back

but vague reports, couched in language hard to understand. It is an open question whether by all their arguments they have cleared more doubts than they have raised.

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
About it and about ; but evermore
Came out by the same Door wherein I went.

Jesus, so sure of God, so fulfilling our highest ideas of what God must be and of what true Personality means, tells us to look into our own hearts. Be kind, He says, and you will find the kindness of God.

It is not the most righteous man who is hardest on the sinners, not he in whom life and Personality are a glowing flame who is most contemptuous of the small spark which burns in lesser spirits, not even the robust who are most scornful of the "physiologically botched," but those whose own hold on these things is not too secure. Mercy is the fit attribute of the great. For one thing, they can best afford it. For another, they know themselves well enough to know that they need it. And they shall obtain mercy.

CHAPTER VII

THE SENSE OF DIRECTION

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

To the mystic or the quietist to whom the Kingdom of God is an inward experience only, this is the crown of the Beatitudes, and as we read it we can easily summon to the mind such a picture as the history of mysticism provides us with—some ascetic rapt in a trance in which he passes beyond time and sense, while with radiant face he beholds the ineffable vision. For this, we conjecture, a stainless purity is the first condition, the putting away of the things of the body and of the active world about us: then, solitude and silence, the last thought of the mind hushed, life stilled until it becomes bare existence only. Is this the way to which we are now pointed?

Mysticism itself is not peculiar to Christianity, but there have been Christian mystics enough, and I should be sorry to deny either the reality or the value of their experiences. No religious life can be maintained which does not send its roots deep down into the things which are unseen. Because they do this the mystics have kept religion alive and fresh into the most arid days of the church's history. There is a mysticism, however, which is negative, which involves withdrawal from life, for it is founded on the idea that the natural order is not only imperfect, as we might expect a growing thing to be, but radically evil, or an illusion from which we must escape if reality is to be touched: that this reality, when found, is so near to Nothingness

that it has just about the same value—that is, if this world order and the experience of life and our own personality have any value at all.

It is not to be denied that the spirit's greatest adventure is the quest for God, but it would seem that the order in which we find ourselves is the place which should lend itself to that quest. That is the standpoint of Christianity, whose central doctrine is that of God manifest in the flesh. *Manifest*, mark you, not hidden. And whatever mystical interpretations this beatitude is susceptible of, the question for us is to discover what Jesus meant when He used it. That seems fairly plain. There is nothing in all the Sermon on the Mount to suggest the desertion of the earth. Its main idea is as we have seen, that the present order is to be transformed and to become the vehicle by which a spiritual order may find expression. It is to become the tools and the raw material of the spirit, and the whole range of human life is to be the deliberate expression of such developed personalities as Jesus pictures for us. The "world" which comes in for hard knocks and is looked upon as the enemy, is not the natural order, but the human order as it organises itself without reference to spirit.

If this conquest of Personality over the natural order is to be won, there must be among those who desire such an end a real sense of direction, the more so that Jesus has not given us a code of rules. It is not enough to aspire, to mean well, or to be sincere. Sincerity may belong to the bad as well as to the good. If the thing a man seeks is evil, his sincerity makes him a greater danger. All the parties in any given war think that they are right. The people who instigated the burning of witches and heretics were sincere. They were not deliberate devils, though their deeds suggest it. Yet we all agree that they were wrong. They set out to achieve righteousness, but they forgot mercy,

and so did not reach righteousness either. A closer study of the mind and purpose of the God they professed to worship would have taught them better ways.

We are to make the Kingdom of God possible. To do that, we must not only mean well—we must do well. We must see rightly what the way of life is, what the will of God is—and we must see far enough ahead to save ourselves the need for turning back and undoing at great cost what it has already cost much to do. If we are to live as sons of the Father, we must so know the Father that we can move and act with confidence.

It is not an easy matter. We are, for example, to hunger and thirst after righteousness and yet to be merciful—and not to be half and half. How to judge in a particular case? At what point would mercy slip away from righteousness and become an easy complaisance with wrong, and so no longer mercy? It is so much easier to maintain a standard of moderate righteousness and moderate mercy, and to cease the attempt to be either when the problem becomes troublesome. The great European war is the climax and reward of moderate righteousness. It is the fruit of years of diplomatic intrigue and of international relationships in which the last thing that has been thought of—if ever thought of at all by the people most concerned—was that there might be a way which was God's way.

It is only an extreme and dramatic instance of what obtains generally. People of goodwill—the majority of the race—are continually being asked to engage in this or that crusade, sometimes represented to us as a crusade for righteousness, at others as a crusade of mercy. Our own country is full of movements, societies, unions and the like, all pro- or anti- something, and the "pros" and the "antis" are sincere enough in thinking that their side is right. How am

I to settle which side to send my subscription to, or whether to send any at all. Not many can afford to adopt the policy of the duke in Mr. Chesterton's *Magic*, and send impartially to both sides, even if that were the way out of the difficulty.

We all claim to want what is "right," but our "rights" seem to be at variance. If we all agreed on what is right, in a railway strike, in politics, in the suffrage question, in the social purity or the drink question, no doubt the solution would soon appear to be both necessary and practicable. But we do not. What do we mean by "right" in these connections? Is there any standard by which we could know?

We saw that Jesus took God for His standard. The will of God, which is righteous and merciful, is the fullest Personality for all men, described as sonship, a conscious partaking of divine life. The test then of what is "right" in any case is not my own will, still less my prejudices, or what seems to be my immediate advantage, but the will of God.

Now Jesus assures us that those who with singleness of purpose desire the will of God alone shall see God. The blessing here is for the "single eye," by which the whole body becomes full of light. Those who really want to know God's way shall know it.

Is it not the truth that in most of our difficulties and decisions we do not want to know God and do His will at any cost? What we do want is to discover what can be said for our own case. We want to justify somehow our own way of life, to persuade ourselves of the reasonableness of our own private claims.

Now it is utterly vain to make professions of a search after God while we are in such a position. It is the most searching and even terrible accusation that is hidden in this beatitude, for its implication is that there is only one thing that prevents men from finding

God, and that is, that *they do not want to find Him*. They will not face the demand that finding Him will make upon their lives. They will search after some idea of God which will fit in with their schemes, but from the burning and cleansing love of God they run away. Yet in that love is all our hope for the attainment of Personality.

Jesus spoke with the authority of one who knew. We cannot conceive of anyone more likely to know. And His assurance is that if we will live out our lives with the single and undivided desire to know and do God's will, we are blessed, for we shall see God. The way to the Kingdom will be made plain to us.

John reports Jesus as saying, "My judgment is righteous, because I seek not my own will, but the will of Him that sent Me."

We are in confusion and involve ourselves in disaster because we do not act so. It is true all round, whether in our individual lives or in our corporate life. The reason why the many great discoveries of man leave him still in bondage, despite all their promise, is that the question of their use has not been brought to this test, but has been decided on other grounds.

That to live with such singleness of purpose is not the mark of a poor Personality, and that to have clear vision of the end to be followed makes for strength and not weakness need hardly be argued.

This, then, is the vision of God which Jesus promises. Not merely the finding of God as the end of an argument or the terminus of an experiment, nor even in some trance of ecstasy, but in intimate touch with our own Personality. And the way is the way Jesus had tried and proved.

It is in this knowledge of God that we serve Him, not as servants, "for the servant knoweth not what His master doeth," but as sons.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PEACEMAKERS

Peace

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God."

WHAT kind of a figure do we conjure up when we hear the word—peacemaker?

Perhaps a busybody going round interfering in the quarrels of others, and incidentally providing food for more quarrels. Perhaps a limp and genial person whose greatest life-effort has been the endeavour to be on both sides of the fence at once. Perhaps a benevolent old gentleman separating two quarrelsome boys by giving them a penny each and sending them off in opposite directions. He probably did not notice the parting gesture of the young scamps which meant, "You wait till I catch you to-morrow!"

Who are the peacemakers? Those who intervene between opposing parties and end the outward activities of a quarrel—say, a Conciliation Board? For example should some person have the power and the will to stop the war which is occupying the world's attention as I write, would he not be acclaimed as a Peacemaker and as worthy of the blessing of this beatitude? Yet whether he deserved the title as Jesus meant it would altogether depend on the kind of peace he produced. Both sides in the war claim to want peace, indeed to be waging war to secure it. Are they peacemakers?

If men are to deserve the name "sons of God" for their peace-making, then it must be God's kind of peace

that is won, a peace that makes for the Kingdom of God, and all that we have seen that great phrase to mean. It cannot be a dead peace, but a live one.

“Peace is a spiritual state, and can only be produced in any man or nation by a free, inward response to the stimulus of fellowship.”*

There are many ways in which peace, in the sense of cessation from conflict, can be secured. It may come by exhaustion, both sides of a quarrel having come to the end of their resources. They retire, calling it a draw, and hasten to make themselves stronger for the next attempt. It may come by brute mastery. One may hold such an advantage over the other that the vanquished is “bled white,” to use the elegant military phrase. Germany thought she had done this for France in 1870. It may come by compromise. The arbitrator comes along and persuades Black that grey is practically black, and that anyhow it is more easily turned into black than into white. He assures White that grey is only white with the bloom off. It is quite the same inside. They go off, each with grey in his pocket, but when they get home they take out their greys to look at them again and feel as you did when you examined at home those cheap things you bought in a dark shop. From that moment the quarrel begins again, though it may be long before it comes to a head. Compromise alone never settled a quarrel yet: it only postponed the settlement.

Then peace may come by indifference or contempt. One may be too dense to see a wrong or too contemptuous to heed it. Or it may be mere stagnation and death.

I have seen pictures labelled *Peace*: a ship in harbour with the sails furled, a battlefield with the dead piled up beside the broken guns, a still pool in

* *The Removing of Mountains.*

which trees and stars were mirrored. The Bible speaks of "peace like a river," quiet, but alive, and moving irresistibly to its destination. And when we come to God as peacemaker, we read that He made peace through Jesus, slaying the *enmity* by the blood of His cross, and so reconciling the world to Himself.

It seems then, God's peace is an active and reconciling thing, that it overcomes enemies by slaying enmity, that it means active co-operation in the ways of life.

To stop a quarrel may be a good thing, but to heal one is much better. May we not go on to say that to prevent one is best?

For too long peace-making has been regarded as men regard the work of a doctor, as a matter for healing at the best, often stopping some trouble we have asked for by our own folly. Doctors, it is to be noted, are beginning to object to this. They talk about stamping out disease.

Peacemaking after the pattern of Jesus is a fundamental work. It starts at the beginning of things and recognises that peace does not come by itself: it has to be made, prepared for. "If you want peace, prepare for war," we have heard only too long. We have had our answer. It would seem that Jesus made no wild shot when He said, "Men do not gather grapes of thorns." Peace must be made by seeking righteousness, not assuming it. It must be built on a foundation of fair-dealing and fellowship, and the recognition of every individual's right and duty to achieve Personality. There is no other way than this.

We must not think we shall have won peace when we have ended some war or all wars, for the act of war by steel or cordite is but one fierce example of the spirit of strife. An industrial dispute may be as cruel as a battle, a lock-out as heart-rending as a siege, a sectarian quarrel may breed as bad blood as a fever of jingoism.

The man who pursues or consents to a course of which a quarrel must be the end is a quarrel maker though he be dead and buried before the smoulder breaks into flame. Those who desire peace, must begin with what makes for righteousness and fellowship, and must endeavour to make their goodwill obvious and clear. There can be no peace if either or both of two nations or classes or persons has chosen "advantage-to-me" for its end, or desires to dominate or play the bully, even though it be for the other person's own good. It takes two to make a quarrel and also two to make peace, but the spirit of co-operation and fairness and open dealing breeds confidence, just as the spirit of selfishness and crookedness breeds suspicion.

Nothing could be farther from the truth than the idea that war and strife are the fit expression of great personalities or that they produce them. That war brings into relief great qualities of heroism and self-sacrifice there is no doubt, but it does not create them, and there are better and more urgent fields of service for their display. "Is there," asks Romain Rolland, "no better employment for the devotion of one people than the devastation of another? Can we not sacrifice ourselves without sacrificing our neighbours as well?" If life has become so tame and sordid that men welcome the field of battle as a dip into reality, is there not in that tameness and sordidness a call to change our manner of life and create a new world. Would not that, if taken up in the same spirit of self-sacrifice, provide a field for heroisms as great as any the field of war may show?

Let us not imagine that peace-making is a tame affair, a work for cowards and slaves. The greatest peacemakers are those who can unite men by appealing to them with the power of a great ideal. That is no task for little men. It is much easier to quarrel with another

and even to win a contest than it is to win a man, "to gain thy brother," as Jesus puts it. The real reason why peace-making has been attended to so little is not that it is too easy, but that it is too hard. It takes too big a man.

Peace-making demands the utmost readiness to learn, a fearless facing of truth, willingness to co-operate, patience, a passion for rightness, considerateness, clear perception of the way of life. In other words, you must draw in all the other features of the man of the beatitudes before you crown him with the supreme gift and write the inscription, "son of God." The supreme gift is the power, not to divide men, for that is easy, but to reconcile men in the pursuit of the highest good, in which they will personally find each his own good.

It is not only hard, it is costly. If it does not carry with it the more dramatic heroisms of war, it calls for heroisms of a nobler sort. Of what sort the example of Jesus, the great peace-maker, shows us. But the world, even the Christian world, has not as a whole shown much inclination to take those risks yet. It has never seriously set about peace-making, though it has talked much of its desirability.

Perhaps the reason is that before people will sacrifice for an ideal they must be led to see its worth. A negative ideal wins no man's enthusiasm and commands no man's consecration. But Christians at least have no excuse for considering peace under such a form. War has had those to praise it with passion, and they have been heard. We may consider that the praise of war is nonsense, but as it has been said, "We may not have talked nonsense passionately but we have not told the truth passionately either; and so, when we have told it, no one has listened to us."*

* *The Cure for War.* A. Clutton Brock.

We cannot put passion into our peace-making until we conceive of the peace-maker, not as a preacher of passivity, but as a great builder of the things that make for life and Personality, the things that strife destroys. We must create conditions which will charge the common life of men with new meanings, open the door to greater possibilities of beauty and joy, and unite them in the willing pursuit of ends which both in themselves and in their pursuit are nobler and more satisfying than the aggrandisement of wide possessions or the intoxication of conquest.

We cannot put passion into our truth-telling until we see the truth clearly enough and love it dearly enough to be willing to commit ourselves and our fortunes to it. Neither peace nor passion, nothing indeed but the deserved contempt of men, can come to him who sees the truth but evades the toil.

“They shall be called sons of God,” shall be recognised as having the divine life within themselves. Surely the topstone of vital Personality, to be reckoned as God-like. But first they must have broken out of the narrow circle of suspicions, resentments and hostilities which has shut man in from the beginning, and which to be shut in has been to so many men, strangely enough, food for pride. Let a man once venture outside and he wonders at his own long complaisance. For he has escaped. He knows it. He has come out into a large place, and the new air he breathes is the air of heaven.

CHAPTER IX

PAYING THE PRICE

"Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets before you."

At the close of our study of Righteousness a question was waiting to be answered. What about the pioneers in every department of life? They have always had to meet the charge that they were freakish and impossible. Every advance in knowledge has been furiously contested by self-appointed custodians of the "truth" who declared that the new was the wildest folly and ignorance. The whole story of progress is the history of lonely souls who went far ahead of their fellows, and paid the price in blood and tears.

That is the truth, and though the being persecuted is no sure guarantee that one is a pioneer of that sort, pioneers must be prepared to pay the price. Jesus therefore adds to His picture of the new man this note as to what fate he may look for as the reward of his efforts. If he is to face reality he will find hardships and even perils, but when he goes on to deny the vested interests of evil, he will find that those who think they profit by evil are waiting for him, and not with a welcome. If he is counselled to be patient it is because there is something to be endured. If he is to have a passion for rightness, he will often be misunderstood. He must be prepared for loneliness, for

difficulty, for blame, for opposition, and even for malice and injury. Persecution is the active opposition of those who do not want what you want. In that sense, the "good" may persecute the "bad." Indeed that is generally, though not always, the idea that persecutors have about themselves. But no man ever learned to persecute another from any connection he had with Jesus.

As we are told elsewhere, to start on such an adventure as this that Jesus calls us to without counting the cost, is only to become a laughing stock. Better leave things alone than put our hands to the plough and then look back. It is just this insistence on the need for the utmost courage and devotion that makes some of the sayings of Jesus sound as if there were a real aristocracy among His followers, and has given rise to the idea of the "elect." Election is real enough, but it is not arbitrary. It is the attraction of one personality for another*. Nietzsche is not far wrong when he says: "The seductive power of the Christian ideal works most strongly upon natures that love danger, adventure and contrasts; that love everything that entails a risk." A dangerous admission on his part, for it disproves so much else that he said. The "aristocracy" of Jesus is that in which greatness is measured by service. But it is open to all. The invitation stands for any who will take it, and the risks involved.

But why should Jesus have given this beatitude the double form peculiar to itself? The first half refers to the past, to those who "have been persecuted;" the second to persecution which may be looked for. Jesus does not generally base His approvals on past instances. Is it to emphasise the blessedness of being persecuted, to promote the temper which seeks martyrdom? That temper

* Bigg—*Confessions of St. Augustine*, II.

became prevalent at one period in the early church, and had to be checked. George Jacob Holyoake, in his autobiography, tells us that his own prison experiences led him to believe that it is not at all blessed, but highly uncomfortable to be persecuted. The jibe, that Jesus added "for righteousness sake," does not apply in his case, though it is well to bear that condition in mind.

The real answer is that Jesus did not approve of the temper that seeks martyrdom. What moved Him most in His own case was that His refusal to flee and betray His mission involved His enemies in a great crime. He only accepted the end because there was no other way open for Him to fulfil His mission. He had tried all other ways. The counsel He gave to His disciples in one case—not as a universal rule—was: "If they persecute you in one city, flee to the next."

There is no happiness in *being* persecuted. The immediate experience is one that all who have in the least degree known it will desire to avoid. It often seems humiliating, and it puts the Christian out of that fellowship with others which he seeks. The blessing is not attached to the experience, but to the result, based on the fact that persecution has never yet been able finally to smother or destroy truth. The Kingdom of God still comes. It was "for the joy that was set before Him" that Jesus endured the cross, not for any joy in the experience.

Jesus therefore begins by pointing us to those who have been persecuted, to those who "for righteousness' sake" suffered, and maybe died. Did they ever rue it? Can we wish that they had been more pliable? Never! The one thing we do feel is that what they won was worth the price they paid. Is that so? Then, blessed are *you*? when men shall persecute *you*. Rejoice and be glad, for you are in

the succession. The same fate is yours, and the same reward. Blessed are you.

“Not a grave of the murder'd for freedom but grows seed for freedom, in its turn to bear seed,
Which the winds carry afar and re-sow, and the rains and the snows nourish.”

The Kingdom of God is worth all we can pay for it, or it is not worth much. The “reward in heaven” is no mere making up afterwards for what has been suffered and endured now. The reward is that we have shared in the cost, that we have paid a part of the price, and can enter into an inheritance that has not wholly been the fruit of the labours and pains of others. We shall not be wholly ashamed to stand before the Son of Man.

mt 5 13-15

CHAPTER X

THE RESULT

"Salt of the earth . . . light of the world . . . a city set on a hill . . . a house built upon the rock."

JESUS has now drawn His picture, setting out with broad touches the type of personality which is needed to make possible on earth that spiritual order which He calls the Kingdom of God. A man ready to learn and eager to deal with realities, but no worshipper of things as they are; filled with profound dissatisfaction with all that limits life, but never letting his dissatisfaction break out in mere petulance or anger; patient in the face of evil, but persistently pursuing the highest ends; insatiable in his demands for rightness, but considerate in his judgments, kind in his dealings with those who see things differently or fail to reach his standard; possessing the clear vision of the single mind which is not set upon its own advantage; ever ready for fellowship and co-operation with others, but prepared to pay the price of standing alone—this is a rough outline.

What are we to say of him? Is he a possibility, or a fantastic jumble of ill-assorted qualities? Will he make for fullest life or the denial of life? Will he be a weak personality or a strong one? Will the world be a richer or a poorer place if he is multiplied?

The best answer to all these questions is Jesus Himself, Who is the perfect exhibition of all these qualities in one personality. Not that Jesus thought

out a conception of virtue and then proceeded to live by His own rules. His life was the spontaneous expression of the relationship to God of which He was conscious. If His picture of the ideal man differs from ours, it was because His conception of God was different. What we have described as the Will to Personality was to Him the divine actually welling up through human limitations and seeking expression in life. He tells us what He found and shows us by life and word how the complete realisation of what the deepest in us demands is possible. The Kingdom of God will come, not as a swift and shattering blow upon an unready world, but as men see what the divine ideal for them really is and trust themselves to it. The hindrance is, as He found, that men find it hard to get away from the state of suspicion and fear that clings to them, dare not break down the walls which they have built about themselves, hug their exclusiveness and think to add to their wealth of being by the possession of external things and their power to dominate others. We *know*, when we think things out, that such is the fact. We *know* that life on these lines does not satisfy us. Yet we dare not venture on the other.

Jesus has given us a lead: He has shown us a completely satisfying life, in which the divine and the human are at one. And He says, Follow Me, and become in your turn not only receivers of life but givers, salt of the earth, light of the world.

Will the world be richer or poorer if more of us follow that lead? Will our own personalities be richer or poorer? That is the question we must ask ourselves.

For myself I can only say that if there is a more vital Personality or a fuller life than that of Jesus, or one that accomplished more, I do not know where to look for it. I find in history the story of men who won and held or held without having won, the power of

life and death over others. I see men pathetically trusting to their strength and justice, so eager are they to follow a leader, but I am not very favourably impressed with the result. The powers these great ones wield always prove to be too much for them. They make in the end for death and not life. It is notorious that the great ones in power must be surrounded by mediocrities. They cannot do with other great and free personalities too near to them. The little stool which is said to be needed when the group photograph is being taken is typical of much.

And Jesus *succeeded*. That the divine way must be the only finally successful way is clear. Where is he who, living from any principle which Jesus opposes, could say, "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." True, Jesus died, and the end was tragic. Napoleon, to take a typical strong man, also died. Which was the worthier end? On his own well-known confession, Napoleon failed, and Jesus succeeded. We may freely admit the greatness of Napoleon, while we recognise that this greatness was turned in the wrong direction, and that one of him is as many as the world can profitably do with. He is a mighty example of how not to do it, and this, not by some sentimental test, but by the test of satisfaction for the Will to Personality. He never found that satisfaction. "He was corrupted," Nietzsche admits, "by the means he had to stoop to, and had lost noblesse of character."

The "great ones" have been on the wrong track. Almost universally they have been on the wrong track. And the track to which Nietzsche now points us is not a new track. It needed no discovery, for it is the best worn track in the world. All manner of fine things and some sordid ones are to be found at the end of it, but not life, not fulness of Personality. History is a long testimony to its failure.

Ye are the salt of the earth—but where has the Christian Church been all this time? It has had nearly two thousand years in which to sweeten life, to produce great personalities, to lighten the world. Is it not as much a failure as anything else? Is not its failure the proof that the way of Jesus, however splendid, will not work in a practical and busy world?

One cannot wonder at the question, and we must honestly answer it. The church is not by any means an entire failure. It has produced some of the greatest personalities, and a better average of Personality than any other institution. It has kept alive the spirit of Jesus to this extent at least, that He and His way are still a living issue. This is not the place to argue the pros and cons of the church's doings. We can get more quickly to our point by asking a question.

Has the church failed, whether its failure be in little or in much, because it has adopted the way of Jesus? Is it the method or its imperfect and partial application that has been wrong?

There can be no doubt about the answer. As Christians we must frankly confess that we have not lived by the method of Jesus, except in part. We have not dared to trust ourselves to it. Christ has been divine in the creeds. We have been very fierce indeed with those who did not make Him divine enough—in our creeds. But in practice we have thought that we knew better than Jesus. Our bishops have told us that the Sermon on the Mount is not practicable, and we have found a new beatitude for them:—

Blessed are the moderate, for they do not put too great a strain on our virtue.

“If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing. . . .”

I do not altogether wonder at Nietzsche. He picked up a handful of salt that he found about him, and tasted it. . . . Then he went in disgust to

his own laboratory and set about creating a new compound, taking care, as he thought, to get plenty of flavour into it. And the result? There is a tonic taste in it, a touch of bitterness as well, and a subtle something that seems to go to the head and make men act and talk wildly—particularly talk. It might be compared, perhaps, to the *Tono Bungay* of Mr. H. G. Wells's novel, and the spirit in which Nietzsche sometimes wrote to that of Bill in Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara*:—"I'm no gin drinker, but when I want to give my girl a good 'idin', I like to have a bit o' the devil in me. See?"

Certainly the new compound is not salt.

Yet the way of Jesus and the words of Jesus still stand. Salt is good, salt and sunshine. In these days, when European civilisation, built as it is on the ideals of force, dominance and self advantage, has gone down like a castle of sand, and shown itself helpless to stem the rush of the worst and lowest passions of men, would it not be worth while, perhaps, at any rate to *try* the method of Jesus.

Those of us, at least, who name the name of Christ must ask ourselves: Are we merely flavoured with salt, or are we salt itself? Is our virtue merely that of custom or habit, or does it spring from our own consciousness as sons of the Father? Do we merely reflect a light which shines upon us, or are we light, burning and shining? Jesus demands original virtue of us. His teaching is not given to bind or cripple us, nor even to put us in leading strings, but to direct us to the means of light in ourselves, the salt hidden in our own hearts.

Yet the aim of Jesus is not merely that those who follow Him should be noticeable. They will be so, but not because they set out with that end in view. They may often do the conventional things, but their observance of convention may be more exciting than

another's denial of it. There is such a thing as slavery to unconventionalism, a dreadful state when a man dare not do the obvious thing. The unconventional may be as much of a routine as the conventional, and more of a slavery.

The true difference is, that to the Christian, life is to be an art, and not either a routine or a mere job to be done anyhow. He may do things conventional or unconventional, but he will do them with distinction, just so far as he has the mind and spirit of Christ. It was the way He did things as well as what He did that marked Jesus off from others. He put Himself into all that He did. It was true self-expression.

It is chiefly by this difference that the true son of the Father will be known. He will do human things in a God-like way. Jesus never suggested, as some theologians have done, that "merely human" virtues are no virtues at all in the eyes of God. He exalted the simple virtues: what we are to do to be like Him is so completely to recognise them as the voice of God that we can do them divinely instead of fearfully and grudgingly as is our way.

The tree will be known by its fruits, partly by their nature, partly by their quality. That method of life is the true way and the divine way which both produces and is the expression of the most God-like Personalities. Not the most showy or the most eccentric, or the most arrogant, or the loudest in their profession of adherence to Jesus, but the most God-like.

It is not our business to judge one another, but every man is judged—well for him if he judges himself. He is judged daily by all his acts of choice, by his power or failure to act graciously and freely in all that he does. But especially is he judged by the emergencies which he has sooner or later to meet. Finally, the greatest Personality is the one that can bear the greatest strain without collapsing. And that is just

the test in which Jesus promises success to those who follow Him. It was the test He Himself faced and from which He emerged victoriously. The new man of Jesus is like a house built upon the rock of reality. He will stand the strain of the greatest test. The test is not death, though it may sometimes involve the facing of that adventure. As Whitman tells us, the real emergency is life, not death.

Such judgments may come upon us at any time, and come to all men at some time. And it is then that we may know, if we are honest, what the quality of our life is worth. So long as things go smoothly with us, and life runs a normal course, it is not hard to live a decent and reputable life. All our surroundings help us, for they are in the main the surroundings which are created by and maintain the standards we judge by. We can live easily then, as Nietzsche might say, as members of our herd. But let a crisis come, whether it be some social or personal calamity which sweeps away all our artificial aids, something that threatens or makes a sudden demand upon our integrity, or merely the unexpected problem, and we are found out. If we have been weak or pretentious or half-hearted, or if we have been merely conventionally "good" or even conventionally unconventional, our nakedness is revealed and should there be, as we watch the collapse of the house we have lived in, any power left to us to see or speak the truth, we may call to mind, if we know it, the little speech of Mrs. Knox in *Fanny's First Play* :

"We don't really know what's right and wrong. We're all right as long as things go on the way they always did, until something out of the way happens . . . We find out then that with all our respectability and piety, we've no real religion and no way of telling right from wrong. We've nothing but our habits; and when they're upset where are we?"

Just like Peter in the storm trying to walk on the sea and finding he couldn't."

It is a searching comment on the collapse of the unconventionally good but the conventional rebel would fare no better. If life is to stand these tests it must be based on reality and not on sentimentalism and pretence, of whatever sort. You do not reach reality by merely breaking commandments, any more than by keeping them, and the young people who take the desperate advice of Mr. Shaw—in his preface to the play—and do something that gets them into trouble, may find that knocking out a policeman's teeth or spending a fortnight in prison is not of necessity more satisfying than the most blameless Sunday School tea party.

No one ever proposed a more searching test of Personality than Jesus. What strain will it stand? With that in mind, Jesus bade us live as sons of the Father. He showed us the way, and Himself stood the test.

'Tis the life of quiet breath,
'Tis the simple life and true,
Storm nor earthquake shattereth,
Nor shall aught the house undo
Where they dwell.*

* EURIPIDES : *Bacchæ* (Gilbert Murray trans.).

PART III

THE WAY TO PERSONALITY

"Spend no more time in stating the qualifications of a man of virtue, but endeavour to get them."—MARCUS AURELIUS.

CHAPTER I

ANOTHER LOOK AT JESUS HIMSELF

"Christ on the Cross is still the most sublime symbol—even now."—NIETZSCHE.

As I observed in an earlier chapter, there are many who stop at this point, assuming either that these counsels of Jesus on conduct are all that He has to give us, or at least all that matters to those who are seeking the true way of life. To such, a great deal of what has already been said about the personality of Jesus might seem superfluous. I hope to make it quite clear that it is not, that He Himself is really the significant part of His message, not only because His personality guarantees its truth, but because He transcends it.

It is clear that we can only know the nature and catch some hint of the purpose of the Creative Will by observing it in action and noticing its expression. It is in human personality that we must look for the highest and clearest expression.

If we find by the answer of our own consciousness that Jesus has told us the truth about ourselves, we cannot but conclude that He has told us the truth about God also. That conclusion has already been hinted at—perhaps assumed, but it is the only possible conclusion. It is vain to talk about anthropomorphism. The most abstract philosophy ever conceived of man is anthropomorphism. The fact that it is probably highly unintelligible does not in the least save it from that. Jesus is the revelation of God

Himself in human terms, and no other terms are possible to us. It is folly to look for them.

God comes near to us in Jesus. That is the plain fact. Our theological or philosophical interpretation of that fact is a small matter compared to its recognition. His way of life represents the divine way of life, as well as the way for us; nay, because it is the divine way of life, it is the way for us, whose Personality is our sonship to the Divine Father.

We must turn once more to Jesus, for there is much that we have so far overlooked. It is not for us to say that it is unessential. We are to learn, not dogmatise.

We find, on re-reading the story, that at a fairly definite point in His ministry the tone of His teaching changes. The sixteenth chapter of Matthew's gospel gives us a clear feeling of the change. Was it purely the result of the gathering opposition, or did it spring from new perception of what being the son of the Father involved? It is a new feature in the story, and we must look at its meaning for our study.

Jesus came to the conclusion that the fulfilment of His mission could have but one end, a violent death at the hands of His enemies. He found Himself in opposition, not only to evils which limited and injured those about Him, but to evil of an aggressive sort which threatened His own life. He found men with vested interests in the order which He conceived to be contrary to the Father's will, men who were not disposed to yield them. This new life that Jesus preached menaced their security. They were in danger of being found out, perhaps of finding themselves out, and in self-defence they resolved to crush Him. They did not put it so. It was in the interests of "our nation" that they moved, and finally in the interest of "Cæsar" that they overcame the scruples of Pilate. But we are not taken in by that kind of talk when it

has to do with something that happened long ago. The result we know. Jesus met the death of a common malefactor. They silenced the voice and put away the life that had reproached them. Organised power prevailed. Did it ?

Let us imagine ourselves interested spectators of this conflict between Jesus and His enemies. We have seen the growing opposition. We know that they have at length made up their minds to be rid of Him, and that Jesus is quite aware of the position. What will He do ?

He might attempt some sort of a revolution, as others had done. He might succeed and become David II. ; or if not, is there a more glorious end than to die in battle for the liberty of one's own nation ? Men say that there is not.

This is not an idle fancy. There were nationalist hopes afoot, and had Jesus set about it He could have mustered a strong following and stayed the hand of His Jewish enemies. Things said in the gospels by the way suggest that Jesus did really disappoint the hopes of many in that direction. But He did not choose that way, and we feel that it would not have been consistent with what else we know of Him if He had done so.

But there were other ways left. He might recognise the impossible position and prudently retire into obscurity. If He felt that He must continue His teaching, He might make terms with the Jewish authorities by putting Himself under their patronage. They were not all His enemies, and had He been willing to confine Himself to such counsels as we have been considering, there is no reason why He should not have made peace with them. Or, if that was impossible, He might Himself appeal to Roman power and Roman justice and get some guarantee of protection. That would be sensible, for His enemies would

be foiled, and He could continue His work. Was not His work and His message everything to Him?

We know that He did none of these things, whether He thought of them or not. And I think we know that He would have chosen the lesser way if He had done any one of them. But on what grounds did He chose the way that to all appearances meant the end of His work and an ignominious defeat at the hands of His enemies? Was it not a giving in to wrong?

We can see that He did not just drift to the court of Pilate and the little hill outside the city walls. It is just as clear that He did not rush joyfully upon a martyr's death as the way out of a situation which He could no longer face. Such theological prepossessions as the evangelists may have had would have kept Gethsemane out of the story had it not been the truth, let alone the awful cry upon the cross. It was a costly struggle, and the only conclusion we can come to is that Jesus accepted the cross because He felt that in the circumstances He could in no other way fulfil what He set out to do—exhibit the divine life in a human personality and prove the reality of the Kingdom of God.

We remember some teaching of His: impossible teaching it seemed, destructive of dignity and almost an offence to justice,—teaching about turning the other cheek and walking two miles pleasantly when you had been forced to walk one, a goodwill that nothing could turn to resentment. Jesus held that this is God's way, which we find it hard to believe. He held that unmistakable and unconditional kindness has power to speak for itself, and will win its own way. This we doubt. What had it done for Him? But we cannot doubt that Jesus saw God so. How is He to make this tremendous assertion about God credible—that God is invincible love? Only by doing what He did.

We gathered from His picture of the son of the Father the conception of a great and free personality which would shrink from no burden, in whom a passion for righteousness and a glowing heart of mercy were at one, each raised to its highest power, who would with undivided purpose act as a son of God and stake everything on the issue, and who would emerge victoriously from the fiercest test. How is Jesus to make that claim good? How is He to prove that the spiritual is the real, and that the man who trusts himself to it has all the power of God and the innermost nature of things behind him? Only by doing what He did.

It was the final proof He could offer of the genuineness of His vision, the truth of His conviction that He spoke from God.

One might ask perhaps if the fact of a man's dying for his belief proves that he was right. Of course it does not in the ordinary sense. But if a man dies because he believes that by so doing his end will be gained, and we find that it is gained, it does prove that he was right in that belief. Jesus died, and it is not too much to say that He made a different world and gave life a new meaning. From the cross He conquers. And in Him God conquers. In the words of Paul, He showed the cross, from one standpoint a violent and even repulsive accident, to be the power and the wisdom of God. He proved that His deep intuition was right, and in choosing to trust to that we can but say that in His personality the will of God and the will of man were absolutely at one.

It is the very heart of God that is laid bare for us, God, whose life is not receiving, but giving, not gaining, but bestowing; not self-absorption, but self-expression; a joyous overflowing of Creative Love that accepts evil and suffering and pain, and transcends and conquers them all.

The cross of Jesus is His final expression of the way to Personality, which is simply this:—the will of God at all costs. Quite apart and probably better apart from any theory of the atonement, the revelation made there at such a cost is still able to awake in the hearts of those who see it the conviction that Jesus has told us the innermost truth about ourselves. It strikes to the heart of us as nothing else has ever done. Our shabby compromises, our miserable fears of the truth and of one another, our selfishness, our shrinking from pain and ridicule, our vain attempts to find satisfaction in lesser things, our flight from realities, begin to look what they are. It is just that sort of thing that crucified Jesus. These were the things He bore and overcame.

We see that we have betrayed our nature. Our common way of life is not *the* way. It is nothing less than a denial of God. The true life we see to be victorious over all the things we have submitted to.

The truth about God and the truth about ourselves is what the cross makes plain. When these things are faced and their meaning seen, we cannot evade the issue. Here is our true life, our true Personality; fellowship with God in a unity of purpose and endeavour. The old world in which we have lived must go. Let it be crucified to us and us to it, crucified with Jesus, that we may live with Him and know the power of His life.

The cross then, is no unpleasant incident to be forgotten, not merely a calamitous end to the work of a great teacher, as the hemlock was to Socrates. It was necessary. Had men been different, the end of Jesus might have been different, but we have to take things as they are.

And we have to take them as they are. We can see now more clearly why the way to Personality is not the line of least resistance. It has to be chosen,

deliberately chosen, in the face of contradiction and opposition. We cannot enter it at all until we can make for ourselves a mighty spiritual assertion over against the "world" which ignores or denies our divine inheritance. Jesus has made that assertion on our behalf. He has died for us, to bring us to God, that we might make it for ourselves.

The atonement then, far from being foreign to our subject, or a superfluous addition to the message of Jesus, is of the very core of it.

CHAPTER II

A NEW BEGINNING

“What is the greatest thing ye can experience? It is the hour of great contempt. The hour in which even your happiness becometh loathsome unto you, and so also your reason and virtue.

“The hour when ye say. . . ‘It is all poverty and pollution and self complacency.’”

NIETZSCHE: *Thus spake Zarathustra.*

ONE of the things urged against Christianity by those who hold that it denies life is that it encourages the sense of sin. This is its weapon against the strong: to persuade them that they are sinners, to induce a tormented conscience as part of a taming and emasculating process after which they are good for nothing but to become members of the common herd. It is not explained to us why the strong should capitulate in this way, but we may let that pass. “A pang of conscience is the sign that a man is not yet equal to his deed.” True enough, but “not equal” may mean that he is above his deed, not below it.

Whitman has a curious lapse in this direction. In his *Song of Myself* there comes this curious passage:

“I think I could turn and live with animals, they are so placid and self-contained,

They do not sweat and whine about their condition,
They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins.”

He might have added another line, equally true, which would have made the rest look like the nonsense it is:

They never even dream of reading my poetry!

“Man’s misery comes of his greatness.” Doubtless the ideal great man, always acting from within and always acting right, conscious that nothing could have been altered or improved, might be pardoned for wondering at the sense of sin. Only he does not exist. It is true that nothing that is reported of Jesus suggests that He felt the sense of sin, but it is true beyond question that He has awakened it in countless others. But it has to be added that He has also healed it. That seems to be the taming process to which objection is taken. Let us look at the facts of the case. We cannot merely swagger into Personality. It has to be won, and we cannot win by dodging facts.

Christianity neither discovered nor invented the sense of sin. It diagnoses a common condition, gives a name to the disease and heals it. Its special mission is to assure men that the sense of sin does not mean that they are in the toils of some inevitable, incurable disease, deserted of God, but that rather God will not let them perish without protest.

You do not accuse your doctor of inducing a disease because he tells you that you have got it and gives you its name, nor do you suspect him of base designs on your liberty if he stops you in the street and sends you home to bed because [he sees the signs of it upon you.

When Paul tells us that all have sinned, missed the mark, and come short of the glory of God, he is generalising, doubtless. But his generalisation happens to fit the facts. The glory of God as we have seen it is that He is the great burden bearer of the universe, infinitely patient, kind to the evil and the unthankful, persistent in His purpose of good. The glory of God for us is that we should be sons of such a Father. Have we not missed it ?

Even Nietzsche’s message is: You have missed the mark, you have come short of the glory of the

superman. You are weak and cowardly, human, all-too-human. As the ape to the man, so are you to the superman. He goes farther than Christians, and calls not only for sorrow, but for self-contempt!

This is not to deny that there have been times when Christians have nursed the sense of sin, and taken such morbid pleasure in it as some folk take in detailing their diseases. No doubt there are cases in which people have become self-created spiritual invalids. A vague general confession of sinfulness may develop into an unpleasant and meaningless habit. But these things were never learned of Jesus, nor even of Paul, who tells us to reckon ourselves dead unto sin. Even "evangelical" Christians, who might most of all lie open to the accusation that they encourage the sense of sin have, on their own showing, only done so that they might bring the thing to a head, as one poultices a boil, to give the speedier relief. And a part of their teaching is a "Christian Perfection" in which the sense of sin is entirely absent. The odd thing is that this teaching has exasperated critics even more than their "sense of sin."

Sin, the sense of sin: these are no inventions of Christianity. They are words covering undeniable facts of human life and personality. We are here to achieve Personality. It is our own innermost demand. Have we achieved it? Are we even on the sure way to it? The utmost one can answer is, "More or less." But that means defect somewhere. It means that in some way we are missing the mark. And if we are quite complacently and with blind satisfaction missing the mark, are we the better off for such satisfaction? There can be no hope for us until we face the truth.

The Christian, however, does not come at the matter quite in that way, and he is not able to put off the question by saying, "Ah, well, there is limitation

and defect to be dealt with, no doubt, but that is nothing to worry about. The sense of limitation and defect will probably pursue us to the end." Original sin, perhaps!

The Christian has seen Jesus. Not that Jesus set about creating the sense of sin to prepare the way for His next move upon men, as a priest might. He did not as a matter of fact talk about "sin" at all in the large and general way that we have unfortunately become used to. He found some at least who were conscious of a burden. He offered to relieve them. He found others ready to obey a call, and He called them. He found others apparently very well satisfied with themselves, and thought that there would have been more hope for them if they had been otherwise. For He saw that they were really blind and did not know it. But what He chiefly did was to show the way of life and live it as had never been done before. He assured men that evil was not inevitable. It was there to be overcome, and could be overcome, but not by the methods in common use. Some men did evil: it seemed to be the only way to secure themselves in a world where everyone else did it. Still more acquiesced in evil and drifted into the doing of it. To some it was a burden, but the best way they could think of for dealing with it was to turn it against itself. That method sounds hopeful, and is being extensively practised at the present moment, but it never finally succeeds. You are not likely to smother one kind of weed in a garden by planting another.

None of these methods can end evil. That the first and second cannot, needs no argument. Jesus knew that the third cannot. Will Satan cast out Satan? Jesus does not stop there, however, but shows us the true way—God's way. He pursues that way to the end, showing "the only thing which to-day proves whether a man has any value or not, namely, the

capacity of sticking to his guns."* That His choice "to live true rather than die false" cost Him life was due to the fact that men refused His message. It is a revelation of the depths to which consent to evil will plunge even respectable men. But none the less, Jesus met evil in its most violent form and transcended it.

The Christian is the man who has seen these things. Possibly the sense of division and strife within drew him to Jesus, in whom he sees such harmony. Or it maybe that the revelation of a life so satisfying awakened in himself a profound dissatisfaction with his own achievement. In either case he finds in Jesus the explanation of his weakness. He sees that discordant personality springs from consent to evil in one of the ways described. Consent to evil is sin. It is that element of consent which marks sin off from disease, but at the same time provides us with this hopeful fact, that sin is unnecessary. We can withdraw our consent. The realisation that we have consented is the sense of sin, in the Christian meaning of the phrase.

As a matter of fact, so far from Christianity being morbid at this point, it is the most hopeful teaching in the world. It faces the facts and deals with them. If the facts are humiliating to our pride it may be hard to face them, but we can have no freedom until we do. We are only deceiving ourselves if we go off in sentimentalities about the strong man and so forth. It is the merest froth. The really strong men are well aware of their own weaknesses and failures. Their strength is in their refusal to deceive themselves.

There is only one man who can afford not to know the sense of sin, it is the man who is living as the son of God. There is only one man who *can* have the sense

* *Will to Power*, 96.

of sin, the man who, because of his nature, *ought* to be living as the son of God.

In the bottom of our hearts we know it. The desire for perfection, the unseen standard we judge by, the impulse to self-giving are there. If these things are not God speaking in us, the pressure of God's purpose upon us, then there is no God who matters. But we are afraid of these things. We do not know what it might lead to if we trusted them absolutely. It is too much for us to be the sons of God. Maybe we succeed in stifling these impulses to a great extent by a fever of activities, but never finally and entirely. We have to throw them a sop now and then, but in spite of that they give us many a bad quarter of an hour. I have seen an apparently cynical and hardened magistrate flush with shame on the bench at some reasonable appeal for mercy which the law would not allow him to grant. He knew. We all know: only we are afraid.

Forget all the theories with which the person of Jesus and His work have been overlaid, and look at Him. You will see that Jesus was not afraid. He did, absolutely and without reserve, commit Himself and His fortunes to that within Him which He recognised as the voice of God.

And you will see where it led. Mr. Bernard Shaw has told us somewhere that he objects to the cross as he objects to all gallows or any other form of criminal execution, and that its prominence in Christianity has been a calamity. One can only say that Jesus objected to the cross, but He objected still more to renounce His consciousness of God or to temporise with what He saw to be the will of the Father. His refusal so to temporise was the final triumph of God in man.

The cross has been prominent in Christianity, no doubt, but too often as a decoration, or as something

which meant that all the cost of making the kingdom of God possible has been paid, and that nothing remains but to acknowledge the fact. When it becomes prominent as a fact of experience in Christian life, we shall change the face of the world.

It is the cross which more than anything else convicts us that when we have been talking glibly about seeking for God, desiring to know Him, we have often been running away. We see that to live the kind of life Jesus lived and of which the actual cross was but the final expression is better than to hug our personal security, to be private minded, to live in bondage to sin and isolation and fear. But we see that we have not always chosen that way. We have been, not on God's side, not on the side of Jesus, but on the side of such as pursued Him to His death. We have crucified Him afresh.

Yet one more thing the cross of Jesus reveals to us, perhaps to many its greatest offence. It may be we have been sincere, self-sacrificing, have lived faithfully according to the light we have had. We have taken what seemed a just pride in our integrity and willing service, and have perhaps been ready to say of God, with *Major Barbara* :—

“ When I die, let Him be in my debt, not I in His : and let me forgive Him as becomes a woman of my rank.”

It is the one saying that does not ring true in a finely conceived character. That bit of swagger is only credible if she has enlarged her religion by reducing her God. If she has deserted the Father whom aforetime she knew for the Life Force, it is a fall, though it sounds so brave : for she has come to worship something less than herself. She will not die with the colours. But I think the lapse is Mr. Shaw's : Major Barbara would have known better.

When we stand before that last triumph of Jesus

and let its meaning lay hold upon us, we find that we are in the presence of an ideal of righteousness and love so infinite and overwhelming that all we can boast of shrinks to nothing. We come to see that our only hope of achievement is the certainty that God will not leave us until we have won the thing He brought us into being for:—that is, we hope in His mercy, just as others must do, the poor weaklings upon whom we have looked down with good natured contempt.

But once let things be honestly faced, and we see that the cross also means that the surest thing in all the universe is that God's purposes toward us stand certain and immutable. Let all the surface self-consciousness go, and there leaps up that of God in us answering back to the appeal of Jesus, and with that act of committal the conflict is ended.

That is forgiveness: not the undoing of the past, but certainly a change in our relation to the past. Not the sudden stopping of all the consequences of evil. Not any sort of evasion. We have not escaped the judgment of God; we have faced it. Forgiveness may mean pain, as the coming to life of a limb that has been asleep or the recovery of a drowning person means pain. But it is a coming to life, an awaking to sonship, a new birth. The Way to Personality lies open before us.

CHAPTER III.

PERSONALITY BY ADVENTURE

THE way to Personality is, in the sense already explained, a supernatural way, and its finding is the prelude to adventure. It is not an unnatural way or an abnormal way, and not the way of some semi-legal process or "plan of salvation." We wrong both God and man when we try to force this great thing into the limits of our schemes. That man is saved, has found the true way to Personality, in whose consciousness has dawned or flashed the realisation of his relationship to God. I have no right to say that he must use my words to describe his experience. He may never use the words repentance and forgiveness. He may say, with George Fox, "Now was I come up in Spirit through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new; and all creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter." Or, if he likes it better, he may say with *Blanco Posnet*, "No more paths. No more broad and narrow. . . . But by Jiminy, gents there's a rotten game and there's a great game. I played the rotten game: but the great game was played on me; and now I'm for the great game every time."

The facts are the same. We must not make the mistake of thinking that Jesus set out to teach some new system of religion. He is the revealer of the heart of all true religion. He offers us Himself. He tells us not what He thought, but what He knew. He gives us His own consciousness of the Father.

Paul, who found the way to life through Him, saw Him to be of no less than cosmic significance. But Paul does not use the phrases of Jesus, or only rarely. Certainly we need not use Paul's unless we like them. Not that we are likely to find any very much better. I notice how men fall back upon the old words when the experience becomes too big for them to grapple with, but it is the experience that matters, not the phrases.

Men may come to that experience who have never heard of Jesus, but it is still Christ whom they find, for "no man cometh to the Father, but by the Son," the Christ, the Word of God, who is the presence of God with the human race from the beginning of their life. And I myself will frankly say that had it not been for Jesus I do not know how I should ever have found the light at all.

But, however it be found, the way to Personality is a supernatural way. Whether the conflict has been spread over a long period, whether it has been spasmodic, whether there has been satisfaction on a lower level until a sudden awakening came, or whether there has been no sense of conflict at all and the light has come as gently as the dawn, the result is the same: Christ, the true Master, has taken control and everything has fallen into place. The strong figures of a new birth, a new creation, are not too strong. If men have exhausted language in the endeavour to express their new found joy, it is only because they know well that they have come into touch with something bigger than themselves which has delivered them. The "great game" has been played on them. It is as much a miracle as the healing of the sick is a miracle. That Jesus Himself thought so is clear.

"Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk?"

I leave the Jews to settle this question, but the implication is that both are supernatural. And we have already seen that Personality itself is a supernatural thing.

Now it is utterly vain for any man to deny the validity of these experiences. The appeal to experience has been called "the last ditch of the Christian defences." As a matter of fact it is and always has been the main Christian position. Any other sort of defence is merely an explanation, in such terms as are available, of the undoubted fact that wherever men come into contact with Christ the same experience recurs. From the days of Jesus until now it has been so, and the tale is told in every language the earth knows. Our explanations have been knocked to pieces times without number, and they will be knocked to pieces again, I have no doubt. But the experience stands, and so long as it can be repeated, critics do us service when they drive us to seek new explanations, though perhaps that is not exactly what they intend.

I want to ask in my turn then : What is the essential thing that has happened to the man who has "found Christ," by whatever means he has come to that experience, or in whatever terms he may describe it? Christians say he has been delivered, saved, redeemed, forgiven, justified, regenerated and so forth. What does it really amount to?

Is it merely that a bad man has become good, an immoral man moral, a wild man tame,—with a lot of unnecessary fuss?

No, it is not that. Jesus, at any rate, never talked about good and bad men, and apparently thought that there were worse things than immorality. The picture of the reprobate now become a law-abiding and respectable member of society is not one that Jesus draws, however desirable such a thing may be.

I have heard men say that they have been bad or immoral, or confess to courses of conduct which would be commonly so described, but they do not say that they have become good or moral, and it is not merely a praiseworthy modesty which prevents them from saying so. It is a knowledge of what has happened. What they say is that they have been set free. And I have seen them cry for joy. I have never seen anybody cry for joy because he was moral or good.

The truth is that a man may be as far from freedom, from Personality, by his "goodness" as the sinner by his badness, nay farther, if the words of Jesus mean anything at all. That was the case of the Pharisees, and the reason is that bondage which is made obvious by some chain of evil habit does not readily lend itself to complacency. Men do not go down without a struggle. With bondage which has no such advertisement it is easier to be satisfied, but it is no less a bondage. It was to a good man that Jesus said, "Ye must be born again."

It is not merely a question of men becoming good. The new life is a deliverance. Jesus Christ sets men free. But deliverance from what?

It is deliverance from a bondage which arises out of the fact about man, that he is a step to something else. He has left behind the stage of merely animal consciousness, but he has not achieved Personality. He has not yet arrived. The first step is that of self-consciousness, a keen realisation that he is a separate individual. He draws a circle about the Me and the Mine. Without the realisation of that circle he can never engage in any act of conscious choice nor take even the first step to Personality. But to live permanently in it is a kind of suicide. It is to become a prey to the old animal instincts which are part of our inheritance, a legacy of passions and suspicions and self-preservative fears. If his passions

claim him, then he becomes selfishly bad. If his suspicions and fears are stronger than his passions, he may become exactly and scrupulously moral, and tame beyond words. But whichever choice he makes, to remain in that circle is bondage and futility. Mr. H. G. Wells speaks of "that narrow loneliness of desire, that brooding preoccupation with self and egotistical relationships, which is hell for the individual, treason to the race, and exile from God."* He does not overstate the case.

It is not the badness of men which cries out to heaven, but their futility, from which their badness is but an attempt at escape. If being good offered a more promising way they would try that, but does it? Behold the immense crowd of people who have both gifts and good intentions, but whose lives come to nothing. They are not bad. No one accuses them of anything. They are reasonably honest, truthful, kind-hearted, industrious and so forth. But they are barren. To be a member of that crowd, cumberers of the ground, according to Jesus, is serious enough, and the more serious if the failure is not recognised. If it should happen that such people are conventional Christians, it is more serious still, because it suggests that their religion has not brought them the freedom it promised. One is driven to think that such people, though they do not confess it, must find their religion rather disappointing. Certainly they must if they have ever thought of it as anything more than a pious hobby.

(O you people to whom your religion is a hobby, you are the curse of all religion everywhere.)

Is it any wonder that the superior vitality of the sinners puts them to shame, and is an attraction to those whose ideas of religion have been formed on the vision of the merely timid and respectable? They

* *The World Set Free.*

may be able to comfort themselves with the idea that too much vitality is in bad taste, but they can hardly avoid moments when the careless and happy abandon of the disreputable—who merely do what they like—stir in them a touch of envy as well as disapproval. I was walking along a lane with a friend, and stopped to talk to a man who was cooking his meal in an old tin by the road side. Presently my friend asked, "But where will you sleep? Have you no home?" He stood up and waved his hands in a spacious gesture. "It's all my home," he said.

I do not suggest that he was a bad man. He might well have been a strayed saint. But no one would think of him as a "good" man. My friend described him as a disreputable old scamp, but there was more than disapproval in his voice.

Deliverance from futility, from barrenness, from a life without significance, this is the deliverance we need, and good people need it as much as bad people. The fact is that in this matter there are no good and bad people. There are people who find life and people who miss it. What Paul tells us is not that all men are bad, but that they all have missed the mark.

The good may miss it by some perversion of self-consciousness, like that of a singer whose song is a failure because she cannot get away from the idea that there is something wrong with her dress.

Of course it is never quite so simple as that, but even wears a cloak of virtue. It is, as it please you, our *humility*. We cannot put ourselves forward; we cannot bear being prominent; we will never hold any office; we leave others to do the pushing; we make no professions.

Or, if you like it better, it is *unworldliness*. Everything is so mixed up with evil that we hesitate to do anything. You cannot stir a foot in any movement without running up against someone who has an axe

to grind, some charlatan, some unwholesome windbag. We cannot bear the taint of that sort of person. We prefer to have nothing to do with the things that such people touch. And we have no market place tricks. Leave the cart and the big drum to people who like them.

No, my friends, we cannot get off so lightly. Not humility, but pride is our difficulty, not unworldliness, but fear.

Pride and fear. We cannot bear to be in a position where we may have to face criticism : we fear laughter : we dislike being looked at : we would rather do nothing than risk making fools of ourselves : we put up with evil rather than face unpleasantness : we dare not be singular and go our own way, and yet we cannot forget ourselves in co-operation with others. So we withdraw into our own shell, and gain a shabby and mean comfort from the idea that we could do things much better than they are being done, if only we chose to set about it. We see things evil being done, with contempt. We see good things being botched, with scornful amusement. But we do nothing.

O you fruitless, savourless, has it not dawned on you that you are diseased, that any price is worth paying for deliverance from that congested self-consciousness, that you had better be disreputable and alive than respectable and dead !

I am not abusing you. I hear men slanging the respectable and the good, snorting with contempt at the tameness of their lives and the mediocrity of their doings, but often the only difference that I can see between them and their victims is that they *talk more* !

The cure is Christ, entire committal to Christ, the realisation in the consciousness of Christ, the true Personality, by whom we are sons of God.

Not that such realisation adds magically to the number of our gifts, or saves us the trouble of making

ourselves efficient in all possible ways. It is not lack of gifts that prevents people from being effective. It is a lack of savour, lack of force, lack of direction, due to the inward bondage that holds them back, or renders their endeavours futile.

It is here that Christ is the true Saviour of men. To realise union with Christ is to break for evermore from that narrow circle. It was because Jesus saw how men were bound that He said such strong things about hating the self and all merely selfish interests and taking up the cross. It is the realisation of the same truth in His own experience which makes Paul describe the way of deliverance as one of crucifixion with Christ, and it is a misunderstanding of these things which has led men to describe Christianity off-hand as "the religion of self-sacrifice."

For just as the Christian is set free from the law and finds conduct to be no longer a question of morality, so he has transcended the old oppositions of self-cultivation and self-sacrifice, self-denial and self-affirmation, egoism and altruism. And not, as is sometimes suggested, by for ever choosing one side against the other. The Christian is not an egoist, but neither is he an altruist. Christianity is as truly a religion of self-affirmation as it is of self-sacrifice.

But it is not a prudent mixture of the two, for if it were, we should be back at once into the old conflict. We see no sign of any such conflict in Jesus, nor any hint that the problem troubled Him at all. He was altogether above it.

The Christian life is expressed for us by John and Paul, as a life of union with Christ, that is a divine-human life, such as Jesus meant when He told us to live as sons of the Father. Each writer phrases the thing in his own way, but to both Christ is the divine nature immanent in man and revealed in Jesus. "It was the good pleasure of God," says Paul, "to reveal

His Son in me." To John, Christ is the vine—not its root or its main stem,—and we are the branches.

We can see what Paul meant when he describes the way of life as union with Jesus Christ. Paul found in Christ, the new man from heaven—in contrast to the old man of nature, his true Personality. His great discovery on the Damascus road was that Christ had appeared, the pattern of the new humanity, in Jesus, whom he had so bitterly hated and opposed, Jesus, the perfect revelation of that sonship to claim which involves in practice our identification with Him in His way of life, our acceptance of His whole method ■■ our own, without regard to consequences. Jesus is the perfect revelation and the perfect symbol of the way to life. That is why to Paul the way is that of union with Christ in His death, but not less, union with His resurrection. He is "crucified to the world," by which he does not suggest any denial of life, but the reverse. He has put an end to the old evasions by which he saw that men so largely live. He joyfully embarks on a life of peril and loneliness which was probably the last thing he ever contemplated in his eager Jewish days. But he finds life and joy in it, there can be no doubt of that. He has somehow found the centre of things and lives there victoriously. His whole personality has been unified in Christ. Whether we agree with him or not, he got what we all want, a satisfying reason for going on, and one which calls out every ounce of energy in his being. And, we must remember, Paul's experiences did not come out of his explanations, but his explanations are an endeavour to account for his experience.

But this "dying with Christ," does not that at once declare that Christianity is simply the religion of self-sacrifice?

It is just at this point that the Christian finds that these terms have no opposition for him. Self-denial,

self-affirmation,—the cross is both in the highest degree.

“Whosoever would save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it.”

“Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone: but if it die, it beareth much fruit.”

Both sayings occur in connection with the thought of Jesus about His mission as the Son of Man, and the first meaning is clearly that there may come a point when a man can only fulfil his mission by going straight on and ignoring the consequences. To stop to think about self would be fatal. We have only to ask ourselves what would have been the outcome had Jesus withdrawn or temporised at this point and sought to save His life. Jesus, as we have seen, went on. Was His going on self-sacrifice or self-affirmation? Or in any sense a half and half mixture of the two?

The saying of Jesus is also true in this more general sense, that you can only possess a thing when you renounce it. That sounds paradoxical, but the paradox is only in the form. Phrase it differently, and say, “If we are bound to a thing we are not free,” and you get not paradox, but platitude. When we can do without a thing, we can then truly possess it. But the man who strips himself to the soul because he will not be in bondage to things,—is he engaged in an act of self-denial or of self-affirmation? When a man goes still further and says, “Let life go rather than I should deny the Christ within,” of what use are our little terms to define what he does? On the other hand, is the artist who fails in public because of a sudden attack of self-consciousness denying or affirming himself?

The truth is, he can only succeed in expressing himself when he ceases to think about himself at all. That is the Christian way.

In all this Jesus is but the fulfilment of His own teaching, and the supreme example for ourselves. The giving up of our lives may never be demanded of us, but decisions involving the principle the cross stands for come before us every day, in however minor a degree. And there are points in our relations to others in which the matter is brought to a sharp and pressing issue.

Perhaps nothing of all that Jesus said has been so reluctantly received as His counsels as to the right conduct in the face of active and aggressive evil doing. The way Jesus proposes has been regarded as involving self-denial to a point which would be self-destructive, or at least be destructive of self-respect. At the same time I have never found anyone who could answer this question satisfactorily: "What would you have said as the true counsel for such circumstances?" and then, "Would you have had a higher respect for Jesus if He had said so?"

The truth about the way Jesus suggests is that it demands a power of self-affirmation which only the greatest Personality can be capable of.

It will be well to have the exact words of Jesus.

"Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain."

Immediately there springs up in the mind some concrete case. We imagine this teaching being carried out by some man who believes in it. There is a little episode in the street between him and another. That is how it is generally figured, is it not? Our man is struck. What is he going to do? The striker is squaring up to counter the return he expects. There

is a pause. What is our man doing? Has he no dignity? Is he waiting for another blow? Apparently he is. We are not quite clear how it ends. It seems to stop indeterminately. . . .

Do you think I'm going to stand that sort of thing?

Or maybe the picture is the other favourite one: the helpless child in the hands of the huge bully. I come along in the nick of time and heroically fling myself. . . . But no, I am to appeal to the bully's finer feelings. He has no finer feelings. He meets my protests with curses. I plead, I weep, I even beseech him to cut my throat instead. Finally I watch him depart. . . . I may even be accused of the murder!

What, sir! do you think I'm going to do that sort of thing?

Now obviously, there is no word of Jesus or anything He ever did to suggest that the Christian should stand by and see another person injured without any attempt to prevent it other than a verbal one. But to make the amazing leaps that sometimes follow on the heels of that statement is unreasonable to the point of childishness. "Then you admit the use of force, and force means police, prisons, armies, navies, righteous wars and all the rest of it, and the only difference between the Christian and other people is that he has an ideal he does not live by!"

Without stopping to make answer to that, which would lead us too far from our subject, let us turn to our first case, which at least has the merit of being not unlike the one Jesus dealt with.

What was our man doing that another should strike him? It is an important question, for a blow is not generally the beginning of a difference, but the climax. They *came* to blows, we say. If the blow was merely an accident, to reply by another is mere ill temper, which probably no one would wish to defend. What

happened before the blow? Suppose our man to be pursuing some end in which he desired the other's good and getting a blow for his trouble. Returning the blow will not further that good purpose, but show that our man is not equal to his purpose. That is a failure of Personality. Suppose that he has provoked the blow. Then he has so far failed to be a son of the Father. What he does next will depend on whether he desires the evil which he started to cease or not, whether his hunger for righteousness or his feeling of resentment is the greater. But obviously striking back will not make for righteousness.

I have dwelt on this, because the case mentioned is a common sort of objection to Christ's words, and is an example of the way in which the vital question as to what went before the blow is ignored.

But it must be said that we are not likely to get at the meaning of Jesus, by such arguments, nor is it fair to pick out the illustration of physical violence as the thing that chiefly matters. It is not at all a question as to whether it is ever right to use force,* but something much bigger than that.

The teaching of Jesus is a picturesque contrasting of the spirit of the old law with the spirit of the man who acts as a son of the Father. The old law recognised and yet put restraints upon the spirit of domination and revenge, the spirit which hates evil, but sees no way of dealing with it other than the way of retaliation. It is not the hating of evil which Jesus is dissatisfied with, but the method of meeting it. Jesus objected to every form of domination and tyranny, because he saw that they were evil: they thwart and injure the lives of all who are the victims of them, and they poison those who achieve them. His counsel is that if men endeavour to tyrannise over us in any way, we are not to endeavour to dominate or tyrannise over them

* *i.e.* The use of force in itself, of course, is neither right nor wrong.

in return, even to the extent of returning a blow. If we do, we show that we are approvers of the same evil method. But we are to show that we cannot really be dominated in the way they would like. They cannot destroy our peace of mind or our liberty of spirit, nor can they by anything that they do destroy our invincible desire to create fellowship, even with them.

Now whether we prefer the old way or the way of Jesus depends altogether on what it is we want. If it is domination that we admire, other people kept in their places and forced to toe any line we like to draw for them, or if in some purely private dispute our only desire is to score, then we must refuse the way of Jesus finally. But the Christian wants righteousness and fellowship. There can be no victory for Him but the securing of these, for he has seen that his own highest personal life is bound up with both these things. He is out to fight evil, not to fight men. He desires to win the man, not just to win a case. There can be no doubt as to which is the higher aim or the greater adventure, nor which demands the greatest self-affirmation. Even Nietzsche tells us that true heroism consists not in fighting under the banner of self-sacrifice or disinterestedness, but in not fighting at all. How then is the Christian to win the other man, to abolish the enmity that has sprung up between them and threatens the best life of both? The question when so put answers itself. To render injury for injury is but to increase evil. But to do nothing is not to conquer it. It might serve the conventionally "meek" man, but he is the invention of people who have never seen Jesus. It is no exaggeration to say that if there is one thing which the Christian must avoid in any such circumstances it is doing nothing.

The answer of Jesus is that we must endeavour to transcend the evil, not merely suffer it. We must

refuse to let our purpose of righteousness and love be turned aside by any man. The turning of the other cheek is not cowardice, but the loftiest kind of courage. It may represent self-sacrifice from one point of view, but it is equally the greatest self-affirmation which says, "You may go further than that and yet I shall win you for righteousness. For you too desire righteousness in your heart, though you may not know it. I shall conquer you by helping you to conquer yourself. And even if I fail, you shall not conquer the good in me."

Striking back is child's play compared to that. But if you cannot by love turn the other cheek or walk the other mile, you had better fight it out than do nothing. Only do not say that striking back is the most courageous way or the most righteous way. It is only the way for those who are not big enough to take God's way or faithful enough to attempt it.

Is it hard? Truly it is, for it makes demand on the highest powers of Personality. It is impossible while we are thinking about ourselves, but it is not finally impossible, for Jesus did it, and in so doing exhibited the only way which has ever succeeded in winning the evil doer and at the same time conquering the evil. Other ways have ignored evil, and suffered it to grow, have restrained evil doers more or less, have suppressed evil doers for faults which were partly the result of conditions maintained by the suppressors, but they have not won evil doers to good and have never conquered evil, while they have invariably introduced more evils.

We are being driven to see that revenge, vindictiveness and most of what we call punishment are vain things, but there is only one other way, to appeal to and co-operate with the good in men, and that is not possible to the self-centred.

We see, then, that it is not possible to exalt to the

position of a rule of the Christian life, either self-sacrifice or self-affirmation, altruism or egoism, resistance or non-resistance. The son of the Father does not by retaliation resist injury, but he offers the greatest resistance to evil. He denies himself in the sense that he has dropped altogether the question of his personal comfort and even his personal dignity as that is usually understood. But he makes the most tremendous affirmation of his divine sonship and of his right and power to act as a son.

The whole truth is that the way to Personality is both self-denial and self-affirmation in the highest degree. The self which is denied is the little self that would dwell in the narrow circle of self-consciousness and by fear or passion build walls about it. The end is barrenness and futility, a real bondage. But none are able to get away from that silent pressure of discontent, of the Will to Personality, nor to silence the voice that whispers to us of the adventure to our high destiny. It is the call of Christ. Men feel it who have never heard of Jesus, but Jesus interprets it to us as none other can. Where the call is answered, the testimony, a thousand times repeated, is ever the same:—Christ has set me free. The hymns of the Christian church are one long witness to it. Even if it were true, as is sometimes wildly suggested, that Christian doctrine is the invention of the priests, it is difficult to find any explanation of the great hymns other than that they have come out of the experience of their writers.

Long my imprisoned spirit lay
Fast bound in sin and nature's night;
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray,
I woke, the dungeon flamed with light.
My chains fell off, my heart was free,
I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

No more bondage. Neither sin nor sorrow nor fear

can put their chains upon us again. No more "thou shalt not." All things are lawful, and if all things are not expedient, I have the standard within. No more shutting up of life into separate compartments. No more drudgery but a joyous adventure.

All the Christian now needs hangs upon the two commandments which Jesus did not invent, but quote, though He put a new world of meaning into them.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

To God loyalty of the whole personality, loyalty to all those impulses by which God speaks in the consciousness, loyalty to every revelation of Himself that we can find, the whole being directed to the fulfilment of what we see to be His purpose in every sphere of life and in every human activity. In that response self-affirmation and self-denial, self-sacrifice and self-realisation, cease to have any meaning for us.

"And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

To men, then, loyalty: not altruism, nor yet egoism, but the loyalty due to others who are also sons of the Father. That is true even of our worst enemies. They will cease to be our enemies when they realise it along with us, and our loyalty both to God and to man demands that we seek to bring them to that knowledge. Do that, and it brings entire and permanent satisfaction. Satisfaction is what we want, is it not?

To all men it is the loyalty which will not demand some exclusive good at another's cost, but would rather bestow, which will not hasten to take advantage of some accidental privilege or opportunity, but claims for others such things as it claims for self; which does not stand apart, but realises that finally we can

only succeed together. That is the real meaning of the golden rule, which has afforded such sport to smart epigram makers.

I have used "loyalty" as a synonym for love, to emphasise the fact that the New Testament word is an unusual one. It is not the love of affectionate and familiar friendship, nor the love of man for woman. It is an intense and ardent loyalty.

For the Christian this love for God and man are included in a passion of loyalty to Christ, in whom God and man are revealed. It has been well said, "There are three qualities which will enable a person to endure all hardships:—an unquestioning belief in a beneficent God, an absorbing love for an individual, or a burning enthusiasm for a cause."*

In loyalty to Christ all these meet at a point where any talk of self-denial or self-affirmation dissolves in fire, where all foolish "self-consciousness" drops from us, and we find ourselves in a kingdom, not of hard and impossible tasks, but of that brimming love and joy which are the surest marks of triumphant Personality.

Love and joy always seek expression: they are an overflow. Towards God in faith and worship and prayer. Towards man in fellowship.

* *Belinda the Backward*: Salome Hocking.

CHAPTER IV.

PERSONALITY BY FAITH

"There is no explanation of man that does not demand that his spirit is in touch with an infinite and spiritually Personality, in which his true life stands explained, and in conscious fellowship with which he alone can come to himself."

DR. W. E. ORCHARD.

FOR this reason, that we are "immortal spirits walking among supernatural things," we find Jesus laying the greatest emphasis upon faith, which is so obviously a personal attitude. Like Personality itself it is hinted at in creatures which are not personal. But that also we should expect, if Personality is the end aimed at in the creative process.

In personal life itself faith has all degrees and qualities.

There is no unbelief :
Whosoever plants a seed beneath the sod
And waits to see it push away the clod,
He trusts in God.

This is true enough, and there is no breach at any point, but a continuous progression from that natural act of faith to the highest vitality of the spiritual life. The God of Creation and the God and Father of Jesus are the same.

What is faith then as it is related to our quest ?

The great users of the word are Jesus and Paul, and to both faith is at once spiritual insight and the attitude of the personality which follows from it, though sometimes the emphasis is on the one and sometimes on the other. Jesus often expressed surprise at the inability of others to see the things that were so obvious.

That the resources of the Father were open to men in ways undreamed of was clear to Him, and He constantly fell back upon them, with such results as we have seen. He was disappointed that men not only could not, but apparently did not particularly want to see them, and that, though they had His example to hearten them, they were "slow of heart," and shy of making any venture on their own account. Their opinion seems to have been that it was in quantity that their faith was lacking, but Jesus suggests that the lack was not quantity, but vitality. Faith as a mustard seed, little, but alive, can do great things.

With Jesus then, faith is perception of the possibilities of the Kingdom of God, and the venture we make as the result of that perception.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus shows us His new man in the attitude of faith as He moves about in the world and does His work. Faith there appears as a new kind of prudence.

Since the new man is not to be put off with less than reality, we shall not expect him to suffer from the delusion that he can enrich himself by merely adding to his belongings. What he wants he will want for use, and not merely for security, still less for the sake of establishing a claim over others. He will serve God and man, but not things. Since he knows that what he himself most desires is the desire of the Father, he will not be afraid to trust himself out of doors in the Father's world. He will not be the prey of worry and fear. That does not mean that he will behave like a fool and then expect God or other people to settle his debts. Jesus recognised the physical needs of men. We are to pray for daily bread, and the lavishness with which God clothes the lily may encourage us to look for butter as well. But the gaining of these and other good things cannot be his *end*, they are the *means* by which he can fit himself for

service and express the divine life within him, and consequently are not underrated. The new man will not "despise money," or count it a virtue that he does not know how much he has, or whether he is in debt or not. That may be left to the sweet simplicity of the Skimpoles. Rather he values such things more. They are sacramental things, not to be abused or wasted or worshipped, but used, as vehicles of service and self-expression.

He will seek the kingdom in his use of them, and since he does not look upon them as the measured reward of service—not needing the "incentive to gain,"—he will be secure in his assurance that the needed good things will not fail him.

This idea is further amplified in chapter seven of Matthew's gospel. "Ask and it shall be given you: seek, and ye shall find, knock, and it shall be opened to you." Sir Oliver Lodge calls this the assurance of the ultimate intelligibility of the universe. It is that, no doubt, but it is also the assurance of the ultimate goodwill of the universe. There are no limitations to the goodwill of God towards us. As fast as we can conceive of a good, that good becomes possible.

In Paul's use of the word "faith," there is a difference which we might expect. He looks to Jesus the Christ as representing both the possibilities of the Kingdom of God and the true relation of man to God. Christ to Paul is the divine nature which was manifested in Jesus, and in which our own true life is to be found. Faith in Jesus Christ means that we identify ourselves with the way of life and the method of life which He has shown us, and with the Christ who was manifested in Him. The fact that we have done so is our "justification." And to Paul, honest and consistent faith meant the joining with those like-minded, and the sharing of fortunes with the small and persecuted

group of men and women which at that time was the Christian church.

The Old Testament way was that of the attainment of life through righteousness, by obedience to a law given from without. The New Testament way is righteousness through an inward life which springs up in us when we lay hold of Christ for ourselves. The new life, that is, starts with the creation of a unified personality and is its continuous and growing expression. Faith is that vision which makes it possible.

For the Christian that faith was first of all awakened by Jesus, in whom we saw a hopeful revelation of God in man. This is how we could have wished to think of God, had we been able to do so. Jesus reveals to us the God of our deepest desire, the God who answers our highest demand. We cannot think beyond the God and Father of Jesus, whom He trusts so implicitly and with such results. Whatever our faith grows to it never ceases to be faith in Jesus. In the worst days and in their blackest hours, He is always there, that steadfast and serene figure, to shame our fears and put heart into our courage. He is the author of our faith. When we see what His way means for us and turn from our old ways, it is His hand that helps us as we make our venture Godward. We make for ourselves, through Him, the claim He made for us and showed us realised in Himself. Christ is formed in us also, a new birth truly, in which we come back, on a higher level, to the unity of the child whose personality is not yet torn with division nor smothered in self-consciousness. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God."

Of the life which follows, faith is the very essence. What Paul wrote of love we may say of faith. It is faith, no less than love, which refuses to be discouraged by dark facts, whether they appear in oneself or in

others. Faith "hopeth all things." Not that faith, as one sometimes hears, is blind to facts, but that it sees all the facts, including the reality of God and of our relationship to Him. It is faith in God that sustains faith in man, without which nothing good can ever be done.

How sadly often have we seen the worker in good causes, so ardent a flame in the beginning, so confident that the world only needed to hear his message, become at last despondent, cynical, bitter, a mere stir of smoke over dying ashes. Men have failed him, and he has no faith in God. He can do no more, and if he should die for his cause it is of despair.

In Ibsen's *The Enemy of the People*, the doctor who has striven for right and failed says, "I will not say, like a certain person: Father forgive them for they know not what they do." Jesus said it, because His faith was first towards God, and because of that, in men also. They knew not, there was still hope for them. He would not fight them, but win them. Faith "beareth all things, endureth all things."

It is Faith brings into being the good that can only be as the Personality is enriched from those divine resources in which its true life lies. It is faith which sees the new order and realises it. Faith "believeth all things." It is creative. It is in the sphere of Personality what imagination is to the mind. Imagination, mark you, not fancy, which is only a poor relation.

Faith, then, is the response of the human personality to the divine environment in which it lives and moves and has its being. To have faith is to be truly alive. The measure of our personality depends partly on the gifts that we started with, but its development into fulness or its waste depend upon its correspondence with, or neglect of, the source of life. If a man is alive on every side but that of God, he is truly alive

on no side. He is out of the way of life. He is living upon himself, and no man can continue to do that spiritually any more than he can physically. To be alive on the side of God, to be in "definite, full, various, increasing correspondence with God," is to be on the way to whatever of Personality lies open to us at whatever stage we may be at.

Faith and Personality grow together, the one depending upon and enriching the other. Great faith is the mark of a great personality. Faith in turn reveals and realises new possibilities, explores farther and farther the Kingdom of God and takes possession of the inheritance. "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."

The things which are opposed to faith are obvious enough, and so is their barrenness. Scepticism has its place and its uses. It is well to "prove all the spirits," but the merely sceptical mind is barren. It produces nothing. The spirit of gloom and worry confesses its poverty in the lives and even in the faces of those who show it. The sluggish and half alive are equally self-revealing. Nothing ever comes of these things. They thwart life and cripple Personality at every turn. Nor, on the other hand, does he fare much better who adopts the *rôle* of the superior person, who allows no enthusiasm to stir him, who never commits himself, who is often polished and cultured to a degree, and suggests some cynical god viewing with indifference the weaknesses of men. He seems superior, but he is not. In all that matters he is inferior to the humblest and most ignorant man who has one worthy enthusiasm. In the end his powers cancel each other. He is "splendidly null."

But the commonest failure is, as we have seen, the disposition which is self-centred, which knows no world other than that which revolves immediately round private advantage. Such a disposition is self-excluded

from life, even when most of all it thinks that it is obtaining it.

The Way of Life, the Way to Personality, is the Way of Faith, which reaches out beyond all these things and knows Christ.

Is it true to say, as is sometimes said, that faith itself does nothing, that it is the response of God to faith which makes all things possible? "I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase." True, but Paul must plant, and Apollos water. Faith is not quiescent, but active. It is not only an attitude of expectancy, but loyal choice, expressed in deeds and efforts.

God has put us into a world which is to be made over again into the world which shall express His final purpose of love. It is therefore full of things perilous, things hard and cornersome, things limiting, things becoming, things to be overcome. The overcoming is the way in which our Personality is to develop. There the Will to Power has field enough.

Bernard Shaw tells us, "This is the true joy in life, the being used for a purpose recognised by yourself as a mighty one: the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap heap: the being a force of nature instead of a feverish, selfish little clod of ailments and grievances complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy."

Only, personalities are not worn out, for they are forces of God.

The world is full of things to be overcome, and their overcoming is the will of God, whose resources are at our disposal as we can take them. Resources not only physical, but spiritual, as befits personalities who are sons of God. Why not one as much as the other? Faith takes them.

"This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

CHAPTER V.

PERSONALITY BY WORSHIP AND PRAYER

WORSHIP and Prayer can scarcely be separated, even in thought. The note of one is delight and of the other aspiration, but they will always go together. Worship will contain prayer. Prayer which has no worship in it is unworthy of the name.

Mr. Allen Upward tells us, rather contemptuously, that the Christian kneels to show that he is afraid of his God. He is quite wrong, the more surprisingly so that his book, *The New Word*, is a brilliant attempt to set before us the splendour of the Living God. The Christian worships and prays, bending his spirit, if not always his body, not because he is afraid, but for the very reason that induced Mr. Upward to write his book,—because he has Hope. For, as he tells us, "Hope is the greatest part of our environment. It is the Pull of Heaven. It is the Energy of Longing." The last phrase will nearly serve us as a definition of Prayer, and we might fitly add to his discovery that a book of an *idealist* tendency is one of a *hopeful* tendency, the statement that such a book will be one of worship and prayer, whatever its particular form. But all sneers will be left out.

Worship is the glad recognition of all the ways in which God comes to us, the reaching of the "strength within" to the "strength without," the acknowledgment by the human personality of the infinite Personality in which it has its being. The note of Christian worship is joy. The man who thinks it is fear has been taught in a bad school.

Prayer is aspiration, desire, the energy of longing which goes out to an order beyond that to which our physical life belongs, with which we can co-operate and which can co-operate with us. It is our desire after God, but equally it is our response to the desire of God, the pull of heaven upon us. We do not need to pray to bring God near to us, but only to give Him room and opportunity. He will never coerce us, but if He were not more than near, we should feel no desire for prayer at all.

The Christian has no doubt about these things. He has found not a something, an abstraction, a vast impersonal presence, but the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Christian prayer is that of a liberated and unified personality which has found its true being in Christ, who is the divine in man and the human in God. At this meeting point prayer is possible, not just the adoration and supplication of a being far away, not the losing of Personality in some infinite ocean of being, but communion with the Father who has made us akin to Himself, and Whose will is our free development in sonship. For that reason, it is prayer in the name of Christ, to whom the Christian has committed himself.

It is said that in these days prayer has become neglected, that it is often formal, lazy, wordy, insincere. Many people have frankly given up the practice of prayer because they have felt this, and because they have concluded that new conceptions of the universe have made prayer either impossible or unnecessary. To the example of Jesus, who certainly depended greatly on prayer and made the strongest assertions about it, they argue that Jesus had not our modern knowledge of the fixed order of nature. Possibly not, but the constancy of nature has been depended upon by man from the beginning. He was well enough aware of that. But the real point is that Jesus was

not arguing for the *possibility* of prayer. He was speaking, as always, out of His own knowledge and experience on the matter. And just as the life He bade men live consisted in accepting and trusting to impulses to which they were already no strangers, but which He showed in Himself in all their glowing perfection, so in the matter of prayer He brings into clearness and interprets for us what is already part of our experience,—our response to the environment we call God, our demand upon life.

For, whatever name we call it by, we all do pray, and our prayers have a singular way of getting answered. There is nothing in all the world more powerful than a persistent and strong desire. And our desires already go out to some order beyond the "natural." When we long for perfection of any sort, we send out a desire which crosses all the frontiers of our experience. We make a demand on the infinite. To conceive of an ideal and to desire it is to pray. The artist prays to an infinite beauty he has never seen.

We are in a universe which responds to our desires, whether they are good or evil, wise or foolish, if they are single and sincere. But that is where many of our prayers fail—our foolish ones as well, happily. Because there is discord in our Personality, we achieve nothing, good or bad. It is not in us to choose the evil wholly, but we dare not trust ourselves to the good.

Jesus, in bringing unity to us, sets us free to pray, to pray in such wise that our own personalities are enriched and the will of the Father furthered both for ourselves and the world.

But before pursuing further the relation of Prayer and Personality, there are one or two elementary things that need to be noted, because even Christian people are sometimes led astray by forgetting them.

We have no reasonable right to expect that prayer will give us demonstration of matters of fact which have to be settled on evidence, or which could be verified by inquiry, or that it will supply us with knowledge which by its nature is the product of study and experience. Prayer is not a substitute for action. It is, as John Masefield finely says, "the creative thought before action." It liberates our powers and sets us free to act with decision and certainty, but as a refuge for the lazy and incompetent it is a disappointment.

Nor can we expect by prayer to induce a change in the purpose of God. Our one hope is that His purposes do not change.

Nor may we hope that God will coerce the will of others because we pray, or that He will coerce us, even though we ask Him to do so. He will not take from us the responsibility of choosing. For example, I received the other day a leaflet asking me to pray that God will "stop the war." I have no wish to be uncharitable or dogmatic, but it appears to me to be nonsense to talk like that, if some kind of special intervention is meant, as the words seem to imply. God did not start the war, and we have no reason to expect that He will stop it. To rush to prayer and endeavour to evade results for which our own disobedience is largely responsible does not fit in with anything that we can discover in the ways of Jesus.

For the rest, let us pray, always as children, knowing that some of our prayers may be foolish and impossible, but not, I think, withholding the desires of our heart because we are not sure. We shall learn His will by praying, if we are sincerely in search of it. We can be sure that all good things are His will for us, all that is needful to us, whether spiritual or material, for the fulfilment of His purposes, as well as the needed sense of direction. If it be asked why we should pray

at all if these things are both necessary and sure, it must be said that the end of prayer is not to call God's attention to us, but to put ourselves, by our own free choice, into such an attitude that God can speak to our need, and that, in the case of spiritual good, prayer is the fitting of ourselves to receive at God's hands. But that brings us back to the relation of Prayer and Personality.

Personality helps prayer. It is the measure of the reality of our prayer. We have already noticed in general terms the fact that urgent prayer can scarcely come from a divided and distracted personality, where desire clashes against desire. "A double-minded man . . . let not him think he shall receive anything." It is clear that perfect sincerity with ourselves must be the first condition of prayer. It is easy to deceive ourselves, to pray for some positive good which we do not desire at all costs, to pray for deliverance from some defect to which we yet cling, to imagine we are repentant of some evil temper which we may have discovered in ourselves when we are only distressed at the unpleasant consequences which we have brought down upon our heads. There is little hope for us until we are absolutely honest and undivided, that is, can truly pray in the name of Christ.

"The easy-going notion that certain qualities can be exercised in prayer that do not exist in the character—can be summoned by magic, as it were, and introduced into a man's prayer when they have no existence in his ordinary life—is a fallacy that widely prevails and has many unconscious victims."*

The desires of a distracted character must needs be few and feeble or else contradictory. It seems to be for this reason that Jesus so emphasises the need for *persistence* in prayer. It cannot be for any reason in the nature of the Father. Of the things we pray

* Swetenham : *Conquering Prayer*, p. 25.

for, we may ask ourselves, *Do we really want this?* Is it the sincere desire of our personality? Have we counted the cost and assured ourselves that we are willing to face all the consequences? Are we taking steps to prepare ourselves in all other ways for receiving the answer and using the gift we are praying for? Can we be trusted with it? These are not small matters. Our persistence is the guarantee that these questions can be satisfactorily answered.

And, *do we keep on wanting it?* Is it a temporary enthusiasm that is soon cold and forgotten, or something of a passion? How many of our enthusiasms are chilled by a little waiting! Yet it is of the nature of a spiritual gift that it cannot be given until we can receive it. The teacher can give a pupil sixpence at any time if he has the willingness—and the sixpence, but he has to take the lessons in order, and, however great the boy's desire to read Latin, he must begin with the first declension. Prayer is not a casual thing, it is a going out of the whole personality to God, heart, mind, soul, and strength. If there is not a full agreement amongst all these the prayer is limited thereby. It is only he who has made the ultimate surrender, who is absolutely committed to God, who can begin to know all the possibilities of prayer, and only as a personality is enriched and developed will these possibilities unfold themselves.

Prayer helps Personality. That is the encouraging truth on the other side. Personality has to be won. For often when the central defences are down, a kind of guerilla warfare goes on in the outlying parts, "till all are subdued." And, since the unified personality is but the beginning of a life open to endless development, there is no point at which our very life does not depend upon communion with God. But, whether we have gone some way on the journey or are at the very beginning, or even have not yet begun, that

Personality is there, our true self, a unique expression of God, to be trusted and valued and realised, never to be despised or cast aside for the imitation of some other that has impressed us. To listen for the voice of God as He speaks within, and to obey at any cost, that, Jesus has shown us, is the way of life. And it is only as this is done that we may come to the knowledge of higher reaches of experience, and to such power of Personality that greater powers can flow through us. The teaching and example of Jesus suggest that there is no limit yet perceivable to the powers of which Personality is capable, but His example and the experience of those who have followed Him farthest teach us that we can only know this as we are willing to pay the price. Prayer is not a luxury, it is not mere passivity, it is the whole energy of being going out to God in obedience and longing. It does not bring God to us, for there is no need, but it enables Him to speak within more and more fully, and to enrich our nature by His fructifying power. We grow in likeness to our Father, in the love that bestows, in certainty as to His will, in conscious power to express His purposes, in mastery over life and environment,—that is, in Personality.

CHAPTER VI.

PERSONALITY BY FELLOWSHIP

*" Swiftly arose and spread around me the peace and knowledge
that pass all the argument of the earth,
And I know that the hand of God is the promise of my own,
And I know that the Spirit of God is the brother of my own,
And that all the men ever born are also my brothers, and the women
my sisters and lovers,
And that a kelson of the creation is love."*—WHITMAN.

It must have become obvious to us at an early stage in our study that the way to Personality is not likely to be found in any kind of exclusiveness or separation, and all we have learned of it since will have confirmed that idea. But possibly the insistence on things which are apparently so purely individual in the last few chapters may have seemed to contradict it, and to have given us another sort of picture, that of a private minded individual whose sole concern is his own spiritual development. If that is so, it is only because of the necessity of dealing with one thing at a time. Certainly the Christian in one aspect may be called an individualist, but if he is not equally emphatic on the other side he has missed at least half of his religion, and has badly mutilated the half that is left to him.

If Jesus possessed a consciousness of God that, so far, men have had to regard as unique in its vividness and constancy, it was in His attitude to men that it was practically shown, and we cannot forget that He chose for Himself the title Son of Man, so witnessing

not only to His claim of sonship for all men, but also to the fact that He had a sense of intimate relationship to all, and was so much at one with them that He could speak for all.

And the Kingdom of God, under which figure He proclaimed the fullest life, is also a family, for the King is the Heavenly Father. The ideal life may be compared to family life, in which each member gains Personality by sharing to the full the common life of all, making his contribution and being himself enriched at the same time. Since there is room for all, and enough for all, isolation and greediness are stupid as well as unpleasant. In the small circle of the family this is obvious enough, but in the larger world men are not yet fully persuaded of these things. None the less, the old, old mistake, which has cursed man from the beginning, the idea that having is the way to being, is no more admirable or life giving when followed in high matters than when it is shown in greediness at the table. It seems to promise fulness of life, but what it does produce is a form of self-complacent stupidity which is the most hopeless thing in the universe. It is not a step forward to something higher, but a set-back to the days when a savage imagined that he really added something to himself by drinking the blood of his enemy.

The end which Jesus set before men is no selfish or merely individual end. The improvement of the type Man, which Nietzsche rightly conceived to be a noble mission, is not to be brought about by the production of a few powerful beings who look down upon the common herd, yet, nevertheless, *need* the herd to maintain them in their position. That in itself shows a greatness which is not native, when all is said. Nietzsche himself uses the figure of those climbing plants "which encircle an oak so long and so often with their arms, until at last, high above it,

but supported by it, they can unfold their tops in the open light, and exhibit their happiness."*

It is not the resentment of slave morality, but ordinary good sense which describes this kind of plant as a *parasite*.

Jesus desired to elevate the type Man. He recognised, however, that the only way in which that was possible was by the elevation of all men. The genius comes out of a high level of common life. Nietzsche was more right than he knew when he suggested that the great man depends for his existence upon the common folk. If he sees farther than they do, it is because he stands on their shoulders. The higher they stand, the higher will he be. But if he is there, not to see for them, but to be carried by them, then he is the last person on earth who is likely to improve the type Man, for he is himself degenerate.

To increase life for all, to enlarge the field of Personality for all by the utmost fellowship, is the right direction, surely. It will take all of us, working together in harmony, to realise the victory of the Son of Man, and we shall individually find our fullest life, the fulfilment of our will to Personality, not in exclusiveness, still less in exploitation, but in flinging ourselves joyfully into that endeavour. It is a further illustration of what Jesus meant when He said, "He that loveth his life shall lose it."

Not only so, but to the sons of the Father, any sort of isolation is impossible. It is not Father-like. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus refers to the traditional oppositions which divide men, oppositions of class, race, faith, and so forth. In His own day they were well marked, and we know that He created offence by ignoring them and seeking friendship with the disreputable. This was new in a teacher. The type

* *Beyond Good and Evil*, 258.

of piety which claimed the highest place was distinctly and proudly exclusive. It was for the Pharisees that Jesus reserved His hardest names.

"Hypocrites!"

If they deserved the name it was not that they professed virtue to cover a life of vice, but because they were "actors," as the word implies. The part they played was not really the expression of their own personality, however sincerely they may have adopted it. The sincere humbug is the most dangerous kind of humbug. And their "part" was that of the separatist, who maintains his own virtue by exclusiveness; to put it bluntly, by snobbishness. This is always the temptation of the pious, both of the weak who, seeing evil and fearing to meet it, seek the refuge of some little circle in which they can maintain their integrity by reducing life to its smallest terms, and of the stronger who make themselves rules and shut themselves up against those who will not be bound by them, or maybe attempt a domination over others for what they conceive to be the others' good. Often the separation takes the form of drawing a line about certain human activities. These are permitted. Beyond the line everything is *taboo* and belongs, together with the people who engage in it, to the devil. Such people are "outsiders," along with those who are of another class, faith, or nation, or whose customs and habits are for any reason unfamiliar or repellent.

The standpoint of Jesus is, briefly, that there are no outsiders. The new man is to be God-like in his inclusiveness, perfect even as the Father is perfect. How else can he be the son of the Father? It is a narrow and limited personality that is afraid of others, a tame and weak personality that dare not venture out of the shelter of its exclusiveness or step off the platform of its privileged position, a poverty-stricken

personality that is bored the moment it comes in touch with other interests than the little round with which it is most familiar.

All exclusiveness means limitation of Personality.

We are told that the "great man" must be lonely. If his greatness is native, greatness of a personality that is richer and can see farther than others, no doubt he is lonely in that he cannot find others to share all his vision. He may on that ground be subject to misunderstanding. But while others cannot enter into his secret, he can enter into theirs, and his solitude will not limit him. Moreover he will unceasingly strive to bring others to his level of vision. But if the "great man" is alone because he desires to be separate from others, then he is self-limited.

But further, the "great man" will "wear a mask." He will be unwilling to let the common herd share his secret and befoul his stream with their muddy feet. He will hide from them in proud reserve the thing they cannot understand, and in his dealings with them will exercise a masterly dissimulation. Indeed, Mr. J. M. Kennedy tells us that Nietzsche himself wore a mask, and that being no meek-looking professor, but an imposing figure with a heavy military moustache, he habitually spoke in a very low voice to counteract the effect of his fierce appearance. A clean shave would have been much simpler. But perhaps Nietzsche was not quite so fatuous as his biographer would have us believe.

Is it the great, or the less than great, who cultivate an exterior manner which hides the real person, and conceal themselves from their fellows? If we believe that our personality is God's special expression of Himself in us, it is a wrong kind of self-denial to hide it. It is truly a denial of life. To adopt, as some of us do, a rough manner to hide a warm heart, or to be willing to let such continue on the excuse

that it is our temperament, is to dishonour the divine thing within us. If it is evil we hide, we have seen the remedy.

The Pharisees "wore a mask." That is literally the accusation of Jesus against them. He Himself was open as the day. He met men in the frankest fellowship, and spoke to their hearts by revealing His own.

Enlarge your circle, for that is the true Yea-saying to Life. Let there be no man breathing by whose side you cannot sit in frank fellowship, so far as your part goes, or to whom you cannot give loyalty and service. Let there be neither patronage to the low, servility to the high, resentment of the wicked, nor domination over the weak. This is the way to Personality: Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

It is not too much to say that this ideal of fellowship may be taken as a working standard of value in all questions of human relationship, and in the end all problems, social, political, industrial, economic, sexual, international, come to that. Of any existing situation, and of any proposal to modify it we may ask, and if we are Christians must ask,—Is this the way to promote fellowship? The Christian who judges by any lesser standard is likely to be in the wrong camp, or if in the right camp, for wrong reasons. Tolstoy goes so far as to make this value the test of good art, and though one may disagree with many of his judgments in detail, and think that he is narrower than his principles demand—as is his way, yet so far he is right, in that exclusive art is never the greatest art.

Jesus Himself carries this principle to the utmost limit, and tells us that denial of fellowship and hardness of spirit are alone sufficient to shut men out of life. The Son of Man is honoured by those who have sought fellowship with such as most needed it. He

is dishonoured by and condemns those who have denied it.

“ Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto Me.”

When we ask, what is the observable practical difference between Jesus and others, there is but one answer. Jesus, without hesitation or reserve, obeyed that impulse to fellowship which He found within Himself, because He recognised it as the clear voice of God. We are afraid to do so, hence often, when we claim to be looking for God, as those who were condemned claimed, we are fleeing from Him, and from the way of life.

What then of the Church? Is not the Church by its very nature exclusive? It seems to imply a ring fence, some sort of discipline, certain rules, which shut out those who are not prepared to accept them. Ought there, in the face of the teaching of Jesus, to be any Church at all?

We can best answer these questions by considering what the Church is.

The Church is the company of believers, the communion of saints. Like draws to like all the world over. The man in whose heart the consciousness of sonship has been born will seek the company of those of like experience. He may do this primarily for joy's sake, to communicate his treasure, especially if, as is probable, it came to him through contact with some personality already in such a fellowship. He will seek their company also that his experience may be confirmed and enlarged by contact with others. There is nothing that is necessarily narrow or exclusive in so doing.

The new man will seek fellowship with all men, everywhere, but it takes more than one to make fellowship, and in many ways he may find it difficult to live in fellowship with others for their lack of

response. He is not to give up on that account, but it is a necessity to the development of his personality and to its expression that he should be able to enter with some into a really mutual and spiritual fellowship. That means the need of some sphere where the turning of the other cheek and all that stands for is not necessary. The Church provides such a fellowship, or should do so. The counsels Jesus gives about dealing with an offender who is a "brother" are quite different from those which relate to the aggressive evil doer, because they imply such a fellowship as existing or having existed, and the one object in view is its restoration.

Some such fellowship as the Church provides is necessary then, that our personality may find free room for growth on the new lines, and be saved from the danger of running off into mere eccentricity, which is so wasteful of strength and so often leads to bitterness of spirit. We gain the needful discipline of living with others, of co-operation in common ends and the advantage of common worship. It is true to the facts to say that where the inspiration of Christ has been most felt, men have sought fellowship because they could not do otherwise.

The Church is the body of Christ. This is a Pauline figure, and truthfully expresses, within its limits, the idea that the whole company of those who have found their true Personality in Christ are now to be to the Creative Will what Jesus was in the days of His flesh, the willing body by which He may express Himself in the world. This is not the denial of our personality, but its fullest realisation in fellowship with one another. And it is in no sense exclusive, for the whole truth is that every man is a member of the body of Christ, conscious or unconscious, and will find his true personality there, or in another figure, all men are branches of the great tree of life which is Christ.

Our realisation of that brings us into the closest fellowship with others who realise it, but it also gives us a new sense of union with those who do not. For now we see all men in Christ, and Christ in all men.

The Church is the divine army, but it counts no man among its enemies. If there are those outside, it is only that they may come inside. If there are those who oppose or even persecute, it is only that they may be won. The enemies of the Church are the things that isolate and divide men, the things that cripple and thwart men, the things that keep back the Kingdom of God. It can have no other enemies except by creating them for itself. The "churches," whatever they may be, should be but points here and there where such a fellowship is focussed, small prophecies and examples in little of the life of the perfect kingdom, schools of Personality, members of the divine body.

If they are at any point narrow or exclusive, if their special witness ceases to be emphasis on what they have seen and becomes an interdict against what they have not seen, or a denial of the validity of what others have seen, then they have forgotten their place and fallen into the sin of the Pharisee.

That this spirit has often marked the Church is sadly true. The various denominations are made up of the successors of those for whom at some time "the church" has been too narrow and exclusive, and that chiefly on some minor point. One might expect those who had so gone out to be wider in their sympathies, but it is seldom so. They have often rejected one narrowness to cling the more fiercely to another. A truly catholic church, as broad as the mind of Jesus, would yet be an irresistible attraction. But meanwhile awaiting and working for that consummation are those in all the churches, children of light, sons of the Father,

who recognise one another and join in spirit over the walls that seem to divide them.

There is a point of danger here. It is tempting to a man to say, "I will have no part in this exclusiveness. I will live as a son of the Father in fellowship with all men. Where I find those in the churches whose sympathies are not merely sectarian and parochial, I will rejoice with them, but I will keep outside all their organisations." But this is not really a way out. Its result is only a new kind of narrowness, another new sect, though it may have but one member.

The exclusiveness of others need never shut us in, indeed it cannot, when the consciousness of God comes home to us. The barriers that were about us have been for ever broken down. Love, we find, has given us a new understanding. We see men differently, we can approach them differently. Behind every face the Son of Man greets us: the Son of Man, who is the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

The last word then is this: The Way of Life, the Way to Personality, is the way of Love. To know that is much more important than to agree—or disagree—with any other thing that has been written in this book.

APPENDIX A.

BY WAY OF APPLICATION

I.—THE NEED FOR CHRISTIAN THINKING

“WHAT'S Past is Prelude.” There will be hope for the Christian and the Church when they are finally convinced of that. What remains to be done, and each generation must bear a hand in the doing, is the translation of all that we have seen into the terms of the life of to-day. Not just the terms of thought, but the terms of action. Our business is not the imitation of Jesus, but the expression of Christ in whatever language and activity is ours. Our mistake is that we have stopped at saying, “This is what Jesus said; this is what He meant: admire, believe, and be saved.” We have stopped, that is, just where we should have begun.

The notes that follow are by way of suggestion as to how the principles I have expounded might work out in action. I scarcely expect to find that all Christians will agree with my suggested applications, even if they have gone so far as to agree with my exposition of what Christ stands for. But to me they seem to follow naturally, and will at any rate serve for discussion.

There can be no doubt that the interpretation of Christ to this generation and a practical application of what we find will make the greatest demand upon our loyalty both to God and our neighbour. There are no changes for the better which do not threaten

the security of somebody. Every re-adjustment means temporary inconvenience at the least, and sometimes the endeavour to put into practice what we have seen will look very much like sawing off the branch we are sitting on.

Our first duty, however, is to do some honest thinking.

It is amazing that numbers of Christian people find so little in their religion in the way of a standard of judgment. Yet Christianity does stand for certain things which are not indefinite, and for certain ways of realising these things. How then does it come about that it is quite possible for a church to be conscious of a painful division on some matter of party politics, and that it is so often thought to be impossible to have any convictions on political matters other than party ones? Indeed it has well nigh come to this, that the preacher must not mention in the pulpit any matter which is the subject of political discussion, lest he should be thought to take sides with one or other of the parties. That means practically that he must not attempt to apply Christian principles to any living issue.

Surely it is time that Christians began to think for themselves *as Christians*, and to attempt to discover what the religion they profess involves in this or that matter. I do not say that it will be always a simple matter, but at least Christians might make some united attempt to discover what the Christian way is, before they rush out under party flags in opposition to one another. There is neither love nor sound mind in proclaiming to all men that first of all we are Liberals or Conservatives or Socialists or Capitalists or Labour men or Imperialists or Sectarians or even Patriots—and then, Christians. When we learn to think *as Christians* we shall begin to count for something.

II.—THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

THE business of a Christian Community is to create and maintain conditions most helpful to the development of Personality, to encourage the finest personalities. Its ultimate value is in its power to express corporately the highest type of personal life. To that end the widest possible freedom is necessary, since Personality, by its very nature, can never be forced. We hear about the rights of the community over the individual, but what is generally involved when this phrase is used is the claim of a certain *part* of the community—the articulate, comparatively leisured, moneyed part—to direct and control the rest. Why should they? Have they really given so much proof of superior wisdom?

A truly representative community, based on fellowship, would have ample acknowledgment of its rights, for it would seek the highest good of all, and not merely play off one interest against another and ignore the inarticulate. And the individual would find his own rights in that acknowledgment. It would be his joy to recognise that he belonged to the community and the community to him. But what has been done to induce that feeling so far? Hitherto the community has regarded men very much as stupid and selfish parents regard their children. They are the "good" who give them no trouble.

Immense appeals are made to the patriotism of the common man when the established order of things is in danger from foes without. When shall he be looked upon as a fellow and truly taken into partnership in the common war against foes within, and in the building up of a great community of free personalities?

* ■ ■ ■ ■

FELLOWSHIP.—It will be clear that by fellowship is meant something very much more than universal

nd reciprocal geniality. It means a mutual effort to enlarge the possibilities of life for everybody, and through every human activity, agriculture, industry, business, research, education, art, literature, religion. It means the frankest fellowship in discussion and criticism as well as in endeavour. It means the elimination of all the merely selfish, sectarian, official, class and clique points of view. In all things seek the man and in the man seek the Christ.

* ■ ■ ■ ■

SUBSISTENCE. A community that is Christian would make it a first business to see that a sufficient subsistence is available for every one of its members. That should be guaranteed. If it found those who were willing to accept that without showing any inclination to respond by willing service, it would have to devise ways of winning them to a better state of mind. It would also seek to make sure whether the "shirker" was really to blame. It is at present highly creditable to the self-respect of men that they object to some of the conditions by which they are expected to earn their bread. In a decently organised community shirkers would be extremely rare. Self-expression is a necessity even now, and if all the energy that is turned inwards and wasted on mere self-preservation—the energy of fear—could be saved, there would be few lazy people.

* * * ■

EQUALITY.—We are not hastily to conclude that there will be neither inequality nor rank in the Kingdom of God. True, they are to be measured by very different standards than those in vogue. Rank is to be measured by service and by readiness to serve, and those who have so earned distinction will be the last to insist on it or even to claim it. It is the kind of rank that speaks for itself and needs no decoration.

Jesus was not blind to the diversity of gifts, but He shows us in all ways that privileges mean responsibilities and not favours. As to "the equality of all souls before God," it would seem wise to leave that for God to settle. We are all to be the sons of the one Father and so brothers. Brotherhood does not of necessity mean equality, save in the sense of equality of opportunity to be at one's best and the equal right to be considered a person—and, indeed, this is all the equality that matters. It often should mean guardianship, it may mean at times vicarious suffering, but it never means less than loyalty and it always means fellowship. One thing it never means, that is domination.

■ ■ ■ ■

WOMEN.—Since the Christian Community is founded on the idea of the development of Personality in Fellowship, women will naturally have an equal voice with men in its management, for on this view of the community the last shred is gone from the only excuse that ever had a rag of reason to cover it—I mean, that women cannot fight. The emphasis will be on rearing men, not on killing them. It is in the matter of rearing men that communities have hitherto so woefully failed. The proportion of waste has been altogether beyond what is reasonable. Women, one imagines, will not be so willing to see their costly sacrifices nullified by stupid laws which repress evil-doers—of some kinds—while they ignore evil conditions.

On the Christian view, when we have exhausted all that can be said of woman as lover, wife and mother, and have added yet more on her possibilities as object of desire, housekeeper, provider of cheap labour, political tout and so forth, we have still left unsaid a fundamental thing, that she is a child of God.

Frank fellowship on that understanding, or at any rate with that understanding never forgotten, would

save both men and women much of the tragic suffering which comes from the idea that the emotional disturbance of mating is the highest possible relationship between them.

■ * ■ ■

PHILANTHROPY.—What is known as Philanthropy is not of necessity Christian. There may be a love of men merely as specimens to experiment on or as objects to be cleaned and tidied up—for their own good, of course. The best life of the community is in some danger from a type of philanthropy which is above all things domineering and meddlesome, a passion for managing people. Those who have that passion should work it off on their equals and not on comparatively defenceless people who cannot escape. The philanthropist of that type “objects to the habits” of others, but that is no reason why he should provide them with such satisfying grounds for hating his. He is like an unintelligent auntie trying to make a small child happy, only ruining everything by insisting that the child shall be happy in the auntie’s way!

Of course, helping people on these lines is both easier and cheaper than the way of fellowship, but the results also are those which attend the easy and the cheap.

■ * ■ ■

DISCIPLINE.—The Christian idea of discipline is that of fellowship. The discipline which is being extensively called for (by the people who expect to control it) is of another sort altogether. People complain bitterly that there is no discipline nowadays, but the discipline of fellowship is one under which they also would come, and they do not so greatly fancy that. I hear employers and people in similar position talk as if they ought to have the powers of a warship’s commander, but not his responsibilities. If one should

ask what is meant by the discipline of fellowship, I refer him to anybody who has kept terms in a college or shared the life of any similar institution. The discipline of fellowship helps to create free and responsible personalities: the discipline of domination, machines, noodles, or something worse. When a man has been compelled to "toe the line" by some power quite outside himself, any virtue that toeing a line may have has disappeared.

* * * *

LEGISLATION.—The Christian must always be shy of merely repressive legislation. That the weak and helpless should be protected, and that no one shall be allowed to make himself a centre of infection is well, but the surest way to gain those ends is to remove the conditions under which abuses spring up and flourish, not to ignore the conditions and then violently repress the base minded who take advantage of them, and who, themselves, are often victims. Repressive legislation is often hysterical—witness the impassioned demanders of flogging in connection with the agitation against the "White Slave Traffic"—and the real sinners are not as a rule the ones who are pinched by it. A small child shivering in the cold on the doorstep of a public house may be taken as the type of this result, which was not in the least what was intended.

* * * *

THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY AND THE STATE.—The State as we know it does not by any means satisfy these standards. It is a compromise at higher or lower points between the Christian and non-Christian ideals. In what relation is the Christian to stand to it? There are those who would have us be altogether apart, exercise no vote, take no part in public affairs, but simply live as Christians in a non-Christian community. There is something to be said for this, no

doubt, for, though the Christian shares in the protections and advantages of the state, he suffers no less from the disadvantages of living under conditions in which his standards are not practically recognised. But that way of separation is too much like a reversion to the way of the Pharisee. Surely the business of the Christian is to bear witness to his standards in every department of life. This can be done in most cases because there is nothing to prevent the Christian giving more of himself than the state demands. Is not that part of the idea of Jesus? If the law demands a mile, it cannot prevent us from going the two miles if we are willing.

At the same time the Christian must beware of finding himself in a position where he will have to do in some representative capacity what his conscience as an individual condemns. There are compromises which are merely matters of opinion or of administration, but there are others which are a denial of Christ. The Christian has no liberty to hide Christ by consenting to unrighteousness under an official hat—the hat which renders its wearer invisible.

There seems to be considerable room in all directions for groups of men who will represent the Christian view, continually insist on it, and so screw up the official standards, but meanwhile themselves consistently refuse to be put into official positions which would immediately destroy the value and even the possibility of their witness. The Christian is to be like leaven, but the leaven, though hid in the meal, is not overcome by it.

It is a difficult position, but should that put off the Christian?

And there may be occasions when the only thing remaining possible to the Christian is the refusal to share in some activity of the state which means to him the denial of his own conscience. Before he comes

to taking a step so serious as this he must be sure that it is as a Christian, as a man who is first a son of God, that he refuses, and not as a sectarian or a party man.

And furthermore, he ought to be persuaded that his action is not merely that of a private individual, but will be finally for the good of all.

* * * *

CHURCH AND STATE.—That the Church and the community should be finally coterminous is the ideal. A Christian nation will be a Church. That the Church should be a tool or appendage or mouthpiece of the State is as far from the ideal as it well could be. The Church must be absolutely free to bear its own witness. It should be, within its own borders, the representation to the world of what a Christian community will mean. The beauty of its buildings and of its services, the freedom and joy of its life, the fellowship of its members, in which the things that divide men are transcended,—these things should at once be a prophecy and an inducement.

* * * *

THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH.—All kinds of reasons are given in these days for the failure and weakness of the Church, but only one matters:—that it should not represent Christ. Of that, other things—its petty divisions, its efforts after self-preservation, its elaborate justifications of current morality, are but symptoms.

We want a new synthesis, a truly Catholic and International Church which will stand above all things for the Christian way of life. In such a Church there will be room for every sort of witness and every variety of Christian experience. But it will only be possible when all the separate churches are willing to perish that the new may be created. In losing their life they will find it. The greatest duty of any one of the churches at the moment is to make itself unnecessary.

III.—CHRISTIANITY AND WAR.

THE GENERAL QUESTION.—War stands condemned, for the Christian utterly and finally. Not because there is some rule that the use of force is always wrong. There is no such rule. It would be foolishness. Nor yet because war is attended with great suffering, nor because it is a frightful waste, though these things enter into the argument. Furthermore, there are worse things than the killing of the body, though to say so is not to justify such killing.

(1) War denies certain things Christ stands for. It denies the infinite value of personalities. A man is merely a wheel or a screw in a huge impersonal machine which is to smash or be smashed. It denies the way of life by fellowship. It denies the way of overcoming evil by good—the way of redemption. (These things are true more or less of the whole military system.)

(2) The Christian Church has one business and no other : to represent the things Christ stands for.

THE PARTICULAR INSTANCE. — Thousands of Christians who, before August, 1914, would have assented heartily to the above statements are now quite certain, not only that Christians may participate in war, but that it is their duty to do so. Broadly speaking, the religious press and the leaders of the churches are with them. This is true of all the countries concerned. It is not that it has been discovered that our old principles are untrue or disproved. The most war-like of our religious leaders would not, I imagine, go so far as that. The position generally seems to be that the exigencies of the situation demand a temporary suspension of these principles. For the moment our universal ideal must

be sacrificed to our national need. This is not said for condemnation. One cannot but sympathise with Christians who said: Our government could not, in the position in which it found itself, do other than go to war. We have allowed the government to act for us all along with little or no protest. To seek to stand aside now or to withhold our support would be the meanest kind of cowardice.

But the moral of that is, at least, that we must never be so caught again.

Furthermore, we cannot but honour the thousands of our youth who have given themselves with a devotion beyond all praise and from a chivalrous sense of duty to the distressed. But they want to see war made an end of. Is their sacrifice to be vain?

From any point of view then the urgent practical question for the Christian is: What are we going to do in the future? Our leaders will no doubt endeavour to sound again the old note when this crisis is past. It will be interesting to watch in some cases. But it is obviously vain to suppose that we can let things go on as before, and hope that by our continuing to hold the theory that war is evil and opposed to Christ we shall somehow end it. We have been told already that this war is the "tragedy of the weak though righteous Christian will."* Do we want another such tragedy?

It is time that Christian people of all nations began to ask certain questions:

How long must we be content to be dragged at the tail of government policies and allow governments to pursue ways which make war likely and meanwhile, to assume, as they do, that all our theoretical objections to war will prove to be mere talk when the pinch comes, and that in a crisis our pulpits and the religious press will be with them? Are they still to be encouraged to assume that our patriotism is real, but our religion

* H. G. Wells: *The War that will end War.*

is only a hobby? That is what has happened. The Christian Church and the Christian conscience, after much feeling and talk against war in the abstract, becomes, with some exceptions, a mere appendage of the government. Even if it has deserved such a fate, that does not make it less pitiable.

Can we make sure that it will not happen again?

We are told that this must be the last war, that measures must be taken to prevent any recurrence of a conflict so bloody, so wasteful, and so likely to create enduring bitterness between the nations. Many proposals have been made for such re-arrangements of territory and of international management as will ensure perpetual peace. Let us hope that they will succeed, and do our utmost to help to that end. But is it sufficient for the Christian to await the efforts of others, so that when peace is won he may finally show his hatred of war without fear that any shall doubt his patriotism? It will be safe then. But is this how we have learned Christ?

Can the Christian Church end war—at least so far as it is concerned, or must it bring up the rear?

We have been called upon to repent; to repent, one gathers, for any share we may have had by omission or commission in the events which led to the war. I learned a good while ago that repentance is true sorrow for sin, and sincere effort to forsake it. We have seen in an earlier chapter something of what that involved. We must bring forth the fruits of repentance. We must show God and men and governments that we do repent.

How can we make our repentance credible?

I have asked three questions which I will repeat.

1. Can we—meaning Christians of all nations—do anything to make sure that ambitious rulers and governments will not again be able to use us for the working of irreparable damage upon one another?

2. Can the Christian Church lead in the stopping of war, or must it wait until other prudential reasons work the miracle?

3. Can we make it clear to the world that we repent and are heartily sorry for any part we may have played in making war unavoidable?

We can do all these things, but only in one way. Let the Church refuse to have anything more to do with war. Let Christians henceforth bear arms no more. Without our help the nations of Europe cannot wage war. In view of the present conflict that should come home to our conscience.

That is one side. It may seem wholly negative, though it is not so. It is a guarantee of goodwill. On the other side Christians must, more deliberately and earnestly than has ever been done, extend the field of fellowship. It must be made clear that the church of Christ is something more than a national institution. There is little good reason why the Christians of England and those of any other country should not have as true fellowship with one another as the Christians of neighbouring counties. But if the deputation from Durham always visited Yorkshire with revolvers in their pockets and discovered that the Yorkshiremen were similarly guarded, their professions of fraternity, even to themselves, would ring somewhat hollow. Yet this has been practically the basis on which the leaders of our churches have done their international visiting. While the talk of fellowship was in full flow, both sides knew that there were thousands of Christians, in whose name they were speaking, at that moment under arms which they were prepared to use on one another if their respective governments gave the order. It is to mock the fellowship of Christ to make such pretences to friendship. We must make our desire for fellowship known by means that can bear no other explanation. There will

be only one way after this that European Christians can meet, and that is with all arms laid down for ever. No political treaty can guarantee us against the tragedy of having again to face as mortal enemies our fellows in Christ, and even though the treaty should be backed up by the military and economic pressure of a whole continent, it would still remain the ironic truth—if Christians continue to bear arms—that fellow-believers in Christ have to be held back from one another's throats by other considerations than their religion provides. Better than trusting to any treaty, and by far the best guarantee of any treaty, will be the understanding that henceforth Christians leave warmaking to those who believe in it.

Surely it is possible for the Churches of Europe to come to such an understanding on this matter that the treaty makers will understand that we stand for fellowship, and can no longer be depended upon to deny the principles of our life at their bidding. That is the wrong sort of self-denial. In all their efforts to bridge differences, to break down artificial barriers, to promote understanding, to build up a Europe of free nationalities which shall no longer jealously regard each other across armed and tariff-walled frontiers, but shall each contribute what it best can to the common good of all, they will have our heartiest support, but in playing the game of international chess with the manhood of the nations for stakes,—we must refuse to be any longer a party to that.

Nor may we wait until all are agreed before we individually take our stand. There is a great opportunity for the leaders of our churches here, but we cannot wait even for them. Perhaps we can help them to move now, but when all are agreed our testimony will not be worth much. The waiting of one upon another has been the stronghold of evil since the world

began. It is the excuse for the perpetuation of every hoary wrong. We have learned that the satisfaction of our deepest demand for personality involves unquestioning loyalty to the will of the Father, without regard to consequences, and certainly without waiting upon the approval of others.

In the case of Jesus it meant a course which seemed to be the denial of the nationalist hope of His time, the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel. And it meant the cross.

Whether it means that to us or not is not our concern. But we know that we are denying Christ if we shrink from the way He chose when once we have seen what it is.

“Put up thy sword into its sheath.”

IV.—CHRISTIANITY AND INDUSTRY.

How to express Christianity in terms of modern industrial enterprise: that is a problem that must be solved. Not only has it not been solved but, so far as I am able to discover, there is no very clear understanding of the nature of the problem. It is not, how can a modern industrial enterprise be run so that Christian sentiment—that delicate thing—shall not be offended, or so that feelings of amiable toleration shall exist between employer and employed, or so that no one works too long for too little, or in unhealthy conditions. The employer who was sharp to his own advantage would see to that much, and might even add a little profit sharing at the end of the year, without truly bringing Christ into the business. And he might do all that and much more, and have prayer meetings with his workpeople and preach Christianity to them, and be himself reckoned a splendid example of the just, considerate and even generous employer, and yet only succeed in tempering industry with Christianity.

That is, all this pleasant and praiseworthy demeanour is *not of the essence of the industry*. It is superimposed upon or runs alongside of the business part. And for that reason, though one may gladly admit that it represents a sincere effort to do the Christian thing it fails to meet the demand of Personality and fellowship at an essential point.

Moreover, it is only possible when the business is almost entirely a personal or family affair. When one comes to the modern concern where the ultimate employer is some thousands of shareholders, then that sort of superimposed Christianity is impossible, and if Christ is not in the business, in the very essence of it, He remains altogether outside.

Is it not odd also that in speaking about running an industry Christ-wise we should have to consider it as a problem for employers and masters? It is literally devilish odd, that is. But still, what can the workers do towards it, as things stand? Work as hard as they can, keep sober, never complain, and cheerfully give up a shilling a week each when bad times require it? What more Christian way could there be than that?

It seems to me that we have not got hold of Christ finally in these matters yet, and that our efforts at expressing our religion in the world of industry are too much like the efforts of those who try to introduce religion into music in the shape of what are described as "sacred songs." I am not thinking of oratorios, nor even of the good rousing chorus you will get at a Salvation Army meeting, but of the sort which provide stained glass and tremolo stop effects for Pleasant Sunday Afternoons.

"No applause, please," says the chairman. "This is a *sacred* song."

Can we get at the problem by working out a concrete case, beginning at the beginning and taking nothing for granted.

Here are a dozen men with a thousand pounds each who are desirous of engaging in some honest industry. All I mean by the adjective here is that they wish to take natural resources and turn them to account in some way that will produce things good for life. I will say nothing here about the right or wrong of interest, or we shall never get any further. They want another twelve thousand pounds to enable them to start in a profitable way, and announce their object. We will even suppose that they make it understood that this affair is to be Christian throughout. Possibly that might make it difficult for them to get more capital, and they would find healthy food for thought in considering why that was so. They will have to explain that they understand that nothing is worth doing in this world which will not help in making the kingdom of God possible, and that therefore this business will aim at developing and giving scope to the expression of personality as well as providing for its needs. It will be a fellowship in production. That is what industry means to a Christian, if his religion is his life, and not something stuck on to his life.

But suppose the Christian twelve say, "Well now, we are sincerely anxious to see this business enterprise that is Christian all through, but we cannot begin by talking like that. People would at once conclude that we intend to abscond with their money. We will get the money all right. Suppose you have the money. The factory is built, and the machines are in. We have two hundred hands ready to start. Now what?"

Then who is running this business?

"There is a manager, who is responsible to a board of directors, who represent all the shareholders."

And which among the directors represent the men who work?

“ Oh, come, what right have they to a director? They have put no money into the business.”

But they have put money's worth, to take things at their lowest. If one of the shareholders came along you could not show him his hundred pounds. You might point him to a machine and tell him that his hundred pounds was there, and that he would get ten pounds a year for leaving it there. But because he has in the concern machinery worth ten pounds a year, he is, through a director, to have a voice in the management. The man who puts in labour worth a hundred pounds a year is to have no voice.

“ That is the custom.”

There then, it seems to me, is one important point in which the Christian-all-through method of industry will differ from any other sort. The example, doubtless, is crude, and there are many considerations I have omitted to notice, but this seems sure from all we have seen of the meaning of Christianity, that all who are engaged in such an enterprise will be real partners in the concern. If they are not, then you treat them, in the essential point of their contact with the industry, as things, not as personalities. You have denied fellowship. Many of the necessary details on which men are employed in such a concern have no interest whatever to any rational being in themselves. They afford no scope either for the expression or the development of Personality. They only have interest in their relation to the complete enterprise. To refuse that larger interest is to condemn them to soul destroying labour. No business can be Christian in its nature which does that. All the kind treatment in the world, short hours, pleasant conditions, games rooms, free doctors, and anything else you like, are only coverings for a relation between employer and employed which is wrong at the root. It is a denial of the right to Personality. The employer may be a Christian and

the men may all be Christians and meet in his Bible-class, but the business is not Christian. Christ is not essentially in it.

Nor will He be in any business until Christian relationship is established between all the various people who are concerned *at the point at which business is done*, and not just before or after. The relationship between employer and employed which is the basis of the modern limited company is in its nature un-Christian. To assent to it is to say finally, that the man who has the money has the power and the right over against the man who has personality only. You may be sure that the man with the money ought to be most considerate of the other, of his health and his family and his religious state, and even that he ought to pay him well. But it does not matter how you put it. You have exalted money over Personality, and that is mammon worship.

Nothing will remove that reproach save the admission, in business practice, that the labourer also is a son of God, and that his divine personality must find room for expression and scope for development. His work will then, may be, become a vocation and not a meaningless task. He will not escape discipline, but it will be the discipline of fellowship, the most fruitful kind. What refinements come now will have a real value. They will be the expression of the personality of the men, as well as the masters. The model village which expresses the goodwill of a master is a fine thing, but as the expression of a desire in which the men have had equal share it will be still more valuable.

Is it still a problem for masters and employers only, this expressing of Christianity in terms of industry?

No, for employees have been guilty of mammon worship. In times of industrial dispute I have heard men declaiming hotly about the degrading slavery of

their work, and their determination to starve rather than return before their conditions were complied with. And the conditions? Almost invariably an increase of wages, "a bob a week more all round," perhaps, or a lessening of hours. If they get this they will go back. Are we to conclude then either, that when they talked so warmly about "degrading slavery" and so forth, they did not really mean what they said and were only using strong language out of habit, or, that they are quite willing to go on being degraded slaves if they are better paid for it or have shorter spells of time at it?

It may be and often is necessary to protest against long hours and short wages, but neither of these things is the essence of slavery. The slavery is in consenting or being compelled to labour on a thing in which you can have no personal interest, in selling yourself to the ends of another private person to whom you are merely a thing. That is acquiescence in the denial of Personality and Fellowship.

The trades unions have tempered things a little, no doubt, in some respects at rather a long price to free men, but they have not been able to achieve fellowship between money and labour, for which they can scarcely be blamed, and they have not missed mammon worship. Because of that, though it may be unjust enough in the face of the facts on the other side, they have had much less sympathy from the general public than otherwise they would have had. For though we may do a little mammon-worshipping ourselves, we do not like to see others guilty of it!

Romain Rolland puts it into the mouth of John Christopher:

"As long as you are out for material interests, you don't interest me. The day when you march out for a belief, then I shall be with you."

Come out for Christ's sake and see what happens.

I trust I have made it clear in the course of this book what that means. It will not be merely for more of what is already the price of degradation, but for the rights of personality against the power of money.

I have put down this one suggestion alone, not because I imagine that the representation of the workers on every board of directors would produce an industrial millenium, nor because there is nothing more to be said about the expression of Christ in modern industry, but because I am quite convinced that no movement of any sort will deliver industry or the workers, short of co-operation by labour and capital in a common enterprise, and such co-operation as acknowledges the personality of every man concerned.

I wanted to point out to the Christian, whether master or man, and leave in the emphasis of loneliness *the* point at which modern industry and business denies Christ.

“One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.” That is not a motto for Sundays only, but for Mondays as well. Paint it on the factory gates.

APPENDIX B.

ON NIETZSCHE

It is not because at the present moment he is a kind of popular Aunt Sally for any one who cares to have his fling at, nor because I think that he "caused the war," that there are so many references to Nietzsche in the foregoing pages. The main lines of this book were in my mind before Nietzsche had attained to his present notoriety, and I refer to him because he, more than anyone else I know, has made articulate and attractive certain ideas about life and its meaning which are widely believed in by many people of to-day. That Nietzsche would have utterly disavowed these people does not matter. Most of them have never bothered their heads about his teaching and repudiate it when they see the meaning of their ways set plainly before them. One cannot even call them unconscious disciples, for their ideas are as old as the hills. It would be nearer the mark to say that Nietzsche, instead of being a bold pioneer of thought in these matters, was a camp follower with a note book, "writing up" the actions and standards of others. And this is the answer to those Nietzscheans who suggest that the Christian is of necessity incapable of appreciating the values that Nietzsche would have us live by. The Christian does appreciate them. He has fought these things in himself and has left them behind. He does not find that "with every degree of a man's growth towards greatness and loftiness, he also grows downwards into the depths and into the terrible" (*i.e.*, the beast).

We may sincerely sympathise with Nietzsche's revolt against what is sordid and weak and poor in our modern life, against the idea that "this paltry and peaceful mediocrity" is to be regarded "as something high, or possibly as the standard of all things," though even in this he is, to quote his own words again, apt "to demand great and rare things, and then to declare, with anger and contempt of his fellows, that they do not exist." He is often the "embittered idealist."

His revolt was so extreme that it carried him right round and back again into the thing he thought he was fighting, the very denial of life which seemed to him the chief evil. His doctrine of Eternal Recurrence is the end of hope, and his passion for the terrible, his pride in the idea of loneliness and misunderstanding, his admiration for endurance for endurance sake are the essence of the asceticism he stormed at.

One of the best comments on Nietzsche's teaching that I have seen, I chanced upon in a novel a day or two ago. In *The Encounter*, by Anne Douglas Sedgwick, he appears as one of the chief characters, and a friend says of him :

"It is with him always the desire to surmount himself that explains his theories. The most horrible thing his thought can show him, that he must believe in, that he must test himself upon. It is an act of faith. . . . And at the bottom of his soul lies the renunciation of life, yes, the indifference to life which he so dreads."

His desire for a free and fearless life, for strength to prevail over weakness, for the elevation of the type Man, is a noble desire. But I think him to be utterly mistaken in his main ideas as to how these things are to be achieved. One may say roughly that he wants a life which is wholly made up of

"thrills." That is sheer sentimentalism. The man who cannot see the wonder and glory of common life, and must have "thrills" to keep him going, is not of a very vital type. His taste is suspiciously like that of those who gloat over the luridly illustrated police news which some papers serve up to us.

Nietzsche has said much that is inspiring, much that needed saying, and all that he has to say he says well. When he is the seer calling men to the heights, there is gold in his speech, and as a protest against the flabbiness of a good deal of modern thought he is a good tonic, but when he falls to theorising he is the victim of sentimental prejudices. His reading of the Will to Power is a sentimentalist's rebound from weakness. It is true that the insolence and cruelty of the strong is better than the insolence and cruelty of the weak, but are we driven to these alternatives? His Genealogy of Morals is as fanciful as many other genealogies.

Nietzsche's account of Christianity is parody, but it is sadly possible that he may not have been the real author of it, but only the transcriber of what was presented to him. When he sets over against the weaknesses he considers to be due to Christianity the values he would have men prefer, one is repeatedly pulled up by the thought, "But this is Christianity!" There are exceptions to this, of course, but, as it happens, the exceptions could not exist in the same individual, and, moreover, one only needs to turn over a few pages to find him contradicting himself on his own account.

We Christians owe Nietzsche something if he has helped us to discover that our religion is a bigger thing than we had thought.

Devotional Volume by Dr. J. RENDEL HARRIS, D.D.

THE SUFFERINGS AND THE GLORY.

CONTENTS.—Gnosis and Agapé—The Good Shepherd—
Come unto Me—Obedience by the way of the Cross—
The Sufferings and the Glory—The abolition of the
hard master—The Glory of God in the face of Jesus
Christ—Jesus returns to speak Peace.

“Dr. Rendel Harris’s touch in writing of sacred things is all his own, He furnishes a modern parallel to the quaintness of Herbert and Quarles. . . . Every chapter reveals the careful scholar and the devout disciple of Christ.”—*Methodist Recorder*.

“Each address is marked by profound scholarship, mature religious experience, and loving thought for the coming generation.”—*Northern Echo*

Cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

THE FELLOWSHIP SONG BOOK.

Compiled by

Dr. H. WALFORD DAVIES.

Contains the Words and Music of over
Eighty Popular Songs.

Arranged for use at Socials, Tramps,
Week-end Gatherings, &c.

In 4to., cloth boards, 2s. net.

In 8vo., paper covers, 9d. net.

A List of the various editions of the well known
Fellowship Hymn Book sent on application.

HEADLEY BROTHERS, Bishopsgate, London.

New Edition of

A BOOK OF THOUGHTS.

Compiled by MARY B. CURRY.

Mrs. Curry is a daughter of John Bright, Orator and Statesman, and the Anthology she has compiled is in large measure a selection of famous passages in prose and verse, which helped to mould John Bright's outlook and his passion for liberty. The Anthology also includes some quotations from Bright's notable speeches in the House of Commons and elsewhere.

Beautifully printed, and bound in full leather gilt,
4s. 6d. net.

LIFE'S COMPASS.

By the Author of "The Pilot."

"The Pilot" was a string of pearls threaded on a sequence of thought. In "Life's Compass" the thread for the pearls is supplied by the record of a unique life, St. Mark's record of the life of Jesus Christ.

"Life's Compass" is a collection of epigrams, anecdotes, and illustrations arranged for daily reading, following closely the life of Christ as set forth in the gospel. It is published in a form convenient to slip into the pocket. As a gift book it is all that could be desired.

Three styles of binding:—

Leather, 2s. 6d. net. *Yapp*, 3s. 6d. net. *Cloth*, 1s. 6d. net

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

By ANNA LLOYD.

In this book the events of Christ's life are linked together in a connected story and an effort is made to picture afresh our Lord's Life whilst here on earth.

Cloth 2s. 6d. net.

HEADLEY BROTHERS, Bishopsgate, London.

BR Robson, George Blenkinsop, b.1873.
121 The way to personality : a study in Christ
R58 values / by George B. Robson. -- London : He
1916 Brothers, [1916?]
210p. ; 19cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Christianity. I. Title.

4

A 221.01

CCSC/lt

